DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 216 TM 032 501

AUTHOR Lanting, Ashley
TITLE An Empirical Study of a District Wide K-2 Performance Assessment Program: Teacher Practices, Information Gained, and Use of Assessment Results.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 297p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Elementary School Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Literacy; *Performance Based Assessment; Primary Education; Qualitative Research; Scoring; *Test Use
IDENTIFIERS Grounded Theory

ABSTRACT

This study used a qualitative research methodology to examine how four primary teachers used a district literacy performance assessment. Data were collected through observations, interviews, and documents. Grounded theory and NUD*IST software were used for text analysis and theory building. Findings show that a theory-grounded teacher-empowered K-2 performance assessment program accompanied by the school district's low level of interference could interact very well with teachers' high ethical standards on assessments. When the in-service training was voluntary, teachers did not spontaneously practice comprehended portfolio use or students self-assessment, but rather relied on observation and interview. Rubrics seemed to work as conceptual frameworks for data collection and evaluation, and teachers usually grounded their evaluations on evidence. Dimensional scoring and flexible marking across proficiency levels were implemented, and teachers appeared to focus on student strengths. The information obtained from the literacy assessment was criterion referenced and individualized. Teachers did not use normative language when commenting on student performance. Assessment results were generally used to keep track of student performance and to provide remedial teaching, but there seemed to be a gap between assessment results and corresponding pedagogical strategies. It is recommended that performance assessment programs be accompanied by teacher in-service education on repertories of instructional strategies, but it is not clear whether teacher involvement in rubric development and peer discussions would make assessment results more instructionally useful. Eight appendixes contain supplemental material and some of the documents used in the study. (Contains 3 tables and 79 references.) (SLD)

POOR PRINT QUALITY
Pgs 224 - 289

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 216

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Lanting

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF A DISTRICT WIDE K-2 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM: TEACHER PRACTICES, INFORMATION GAINED, AND USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

BY

ASHLEY LANTING, PH.D.

INDIANA CENTER FOR EVALUATION

Submitted for presentation at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in Seattle, Washington, 2001

TM032501

Bloomington, Indiana

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study employs a qualitative research methodology to examine how four primary teachers used a district literacy performance assessment. Data were collected through observations, interviews, and documents, which consist of procedures and rationale of teacher use of the assessment. Grounded theory and NUD*IST software were used for text analysis and theory building.

The study shows that a theory-grounded teacher-empowered K-2 performance assessment program, accompanied with the District's low level of interference could interact very well with teachers' high ethical standards on assessments. Specifically, when in-service was voluntary, teachers did not spontaneously practice comprehensive portfolio or student self-assessment but mainly relied on observation and interviews; discussion among teachers on assessment was also limited because of time constraints. Rubrics seemed to work as conceptual frameworks for data collection and evaluation (Dorfman, 1997, Khattri et al., 1998, and Falk 1994) and teachers usually grounded their evaluation on evidence (Falk, 1998). Dimensional scoring and flexible marking across proficiency levels were implemented, which did not lead teachers to focus on student weakness as warned by Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998); in fact, teachers appeared to focus on strength.

Information obtained from the assessment was criteria-referenced and individualized. Teachers did not use normative language (Pearson, DeStefano, & García, 1998) when commenting on student performance. Still, in-service on direct questioning technique is strongly recommended (Resnick and Resnick, 1996) to explore higher-order thinking processes and to diagnose learning problems.

The assessment results were used mainly to keep track of student performance and to provide remedial teaching. There seemed to a gap between assessment results and corresponding pedagogical strategies. It is recommended that performance assessment programs be accompanied with in-service on extensive repertories of instructional strategies (Darling-Hammond & Ancess, 1996; and Wolf & Reardon, 1996). It is not conclusive that teacher involvement in rubric development and peer discussion (Pearson, DeStefano, and García, 1998) and teacher experiences on assessments, task types, and integration (Khattri et al. 1998) would make assessment results more instructionally useful.

The present study suggests further research on low-performing schools. It is also important to explore the impact of assessment results on teaching where in-service on direct questioning, portfolio, student self-assessments, and/or repertories of pedagogy are provided.

To my father and mother.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my appreciation to the teachers and district administrators who were involved in this study. I am grateful that they allowed me into their classrooms/offices. They answered my questions, read my drafts, and answered more questions. I admire their professional practices and their generosity. I would also like to thank their students whose normal leaning continued with my presence in their classroom.

Special thanks to the four members of my committee: Drs. Fred Davidson, Lizanne DeStefano, Georgia García, and Liora Bresler. They have tolerated my struggle and nurtured my growth throughout this study. I appreciate their professional guidance and feedback. In particular, I would like to give thanks to my advisor and thesis director Dr. Fred Davidson for his willingness to direct this long distance dissertation—reading my drafts, providing prompt responses (and words of encouragement), and advising strategic work plans. Dr. Davidson serves as a wonderful model for guiding a dissertation. Collectively, the committee pushed me to reach for the highest standards. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES xii

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1

2 LITERATURE REVIEW 8

Performance Assessment 8

Introduction 8
Formats 10
Effects on Teaching 11
Information Gained 14
Factors Affecting Information Gathering 15
Teachers' Uses of Information Obtained 16

Empirical Studies of Performance Assessment Programs For Young Children 19

The Work Sampling System 20
The New Standards Project 23
The Early Literacy Portfolio 26
Primary Language Records and Primary Learning Records 30

Summary 34

3 METHODOLOGY 36

Naturalistic Inquiry 36
Field Entry 38
The Site 40

The District 40
The School 41
Participants 41
The K-2 Performance Assessment Program 41

Data Collection 43

Documentary Data 44
Observation and Audio Taped Data 45
Interview Data 48

CHAPTER PAGE

3 METHODOLOGY (continued)

Data Analysis..... 51

Data Coding..... 52
Memos..... 55

Building Trustworthiness..... 56

Audit Trail..... 58
Prolonged Engagement..... 58
Multiple Data Sources/Methods Triangulation..... 59
Debriefings to Project Supervisors..... 60
Member Checking..... 60

4 THE K-2 PEFORMANCE ASSESSEMNT PRORAM AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL: DESIGN AND EXPECTATIONS..... 62

Introduction..... 62
Design..... 62

Name(s)..... 62
Context..... 64

District's Vision of K-2 Curriculum..... 64
District's Vision of K-2 Instruction..... 64
District's Vision of K-2 Assessment..... 64
Needs for the K-2 Performance Assessment..... 65

Content..... 66

Outcomes and Criteria..... 66
Reporting Forms..... 72

Expectations..... 73

Assessment Practices..... 74
Information Gained..... 79
Use of Assessment Results..... 80

CHAPTER PAGE

5 THE K-2 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM AT THE CLASSROOM LEVEL: FOUR CASE STUDIES OF TEACHER PRACTICES 82

Introduction 82
Ms. Nixon 83

Profile 83
Assessment Practices 84

Integration 84
Data Sources 85
Assessment Methods 86
Communication 95

Information Gained from Rubrics 97
Use of Information/Assessment Results 100

Ms. Carter 104

Profile 104
Assessment Practices 105

Integration 105
Data Sources 106
Assessment Methods 108
Communication 119

Information Gained from Rubrics 120
Use of Information/Assessment Results 125

Ms. Ford 131

Profile 131
Assessment Practices 132

Integration 132
Data Sources 134
Assessment Methods 136
Communication 146

Information Gained from Rubrics 148
Use of Information/Assessment Results 151

CHAPTER PAGE

5 THE K-2 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM AT THE CLASSROOM LEVEL: FOUR CASE STUDIES OF TEACHER PRACTICES (continued)

Ms. Reagan 153

Profile 153
Assessment Practices 154

Integration 154
Data Sources 156
Assessment Methods 157
Communication 169

Information Gained from Rubrics 170
Use of Information/Assessment Results 172

Summary 177

6 SUMMARY DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS 179

Introduction 179
Summary Discussion 179

Assessment Practices 179

District Expectations 179
Classroom Practices 180

Information Gained 184
Use of Assessment Results 187

Clarification 188
Uses 188
Concerns 191

Educational Implications 193

Assessment Design 193
Scoring and Marking 195
Information Gained 196
Direct Questioning Technique 197
Impact on Instruction 197

CHAPTER PAGE

6 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS (continued)

Research Implications..... 199
Limitations of the Study..... 201
Closing Thoughts..... 202

REFERENCES..... 204

APPENDIX

A "ADAMS" PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENT OUTCOMES..... 211

B DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES: LANGUAGE..... 221

C CRITERIA FOR DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES: LANGUAGE ARTS..... 225

D READING/WRITING DEVELOPMENT CONTINUUM..... 249

E REPORT TO PARENTS..... 252

F READING DEVELOPMENT CONTINUUM END-OF-GRADE LEVEL BOOK LISTS..... 268

G HOLLIE'S PROFILE (MS. CARTER'S MARKING)..... 270

H COVER LETTER FOR DRAFT REVIEW..... 274

VITA..... 276

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Coding System	53
2	Criteria for Kindergarten District-Assessed Outcomes Language Arts	69
3	Reading Development Continuum	70

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Advocates of performance assessments assert that performance assessments foster quality instruction (e.g., Gipps, 1994; McLaughlin, 1991; Resnick & Resnick, 1996). They believe performance assessments provide information about the ability and skill level of individual students, which will help teachers tailor instructional content and strategies to student needs (Marzano, 1995). As examined by Resnick and Resnick (1996), when students are engaged in performance-based tasks (e.g., conducting oral book reports, writing essays, and solving/explaining answers of open-ended problems), students' higher order thinking, effort in dealing with complexity, judgment, and uncertainty are fully displayed (Resnick & Resnick, 1996). In addition, through directly observing, listening to, conferencing with students, and collecting students' work samples over time, teachers document, evaluate, and are informed about individual student's learning strengths, weaknesses, previous knowledge, preferences, interests, and styles (Borko, Flory, & Cumbo, 1993; Dorfman, 1997). Salinger (1998) concludes that, ultimately, performance assessments present "a cumulative, rich portrait of learners' strengths, weaknesses and capabilities" (p. 183) which enables teachers to help each student learn more effectively.

Gullo (1994) believes that there are three advantages to using alternative assessments (e.g., performance assessments) in educating K-2 young children. First, children's developmental changes over time are identified and documented; this promotes individualization of curriculum and instruction. Second, teachers have many

opportunities to observe and record children's competence, frequently in various settings; this helps teachers decide which types of activities and settings best facilitate learning for individual children. Third, actual curricular activities are used as assessment instruments, which provides concrete and systematic means for measuring curricular effectiveness and modifying instruction. Thus, it is through continuous, comprehensive, and integrative processes that young children's academic and developmental progress is monitored, and the information gained from the assessment then becomes the foundation for pedagogical modification.

Empirical studies of the effects of performance assessments on informed teaching did show some success. The Primary Language Record (PLR) (Barr, Ellis, Hester, & Thomas, 1988), developed by the Center for Language in Primary Education (CLPE) in London, England and piloted in California (Barr & Cheong, 1993; Miserlis, 1993) and throughout New York State and New York City (Falk, 1995; Falk & Darling-Hammond, 1993; Falk, McMurdy, & Darling-Hammond, 1995), has been shown to impact elementary teaching on language arts. Falk (1994) indicates that through the process of observing and documenting students' performance and their work, teachers became more sensitive to and more responsive to students' diverse learning styles and ways of expressing their learning. Falk (1998) also points out that the reading scales (a scoring mechanism that outlines a full range of strategies, stages, and skills of literacy proficiency) of the PLR provide a conceptual framework for teachers to understand, observe, and discuss (with colleagues and parents) student literacy development.

Austin Independent District in Texas implemented the Primary Assessment of Language Arts and Mathematics (PALM) model in grades K-2 during the 1994-5

academic year. The PALM model draws upon three types of performance assessments: curriculum embedded assessments, 'taking a closer look' assessments, and on-demand assessments (Hoffman, Roser, & Worthy, 1998). In an evaluation study of PALM, required by the district Board of Trustees, teachers reported that they improved their skills in organizing assessment information, communicating with parents regarding individual student progress, and passing on the information to the next year's teachers to assure continuous progress (Hoffman et al., 1998).

Nonetheless, studies such as Hoffman et al. (1998) are rare. Most performance assessment programs documented so far have involved older students (grades three and higher) and were initiated by state or national level agencies. District-initiated performance assessments for K-2 young children have not been documented or examined to a satisfactory degree. Details such as day-to-day classroom data of what assessment information was obtained and how the information was used in a local classroom context (e.g., teaching beliefs and teacher philosophy, subject areas, and grade level) based on the characteristics of a performance assessment program have not been fully explored.

Specifically, much literature deals with large-scale performance assessments designed for older students. The California Assessment Program[1] (CAP) (Weiss, 1994) targets grades 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12. The Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) - Performance Assessments (Khattri, Reeve, & Kane, 1998) is for grades 4, 8, 11, and 12. The Maryland School Performance Program (MSPAP) (Afflerbach, Almasi, Guthrie, & Schafer, 1996) is for grades 3, 8, and 12. The Arizona Student Assessment Program (ASAP) (Mitchell, 1992) is for grades 5, 8, and 11. The New York

[1] The program was cut from the budget by the Government in August 1990.

State Elementary Science Program Evaluation Test (ESPET) (Mitchell, 1992) is for grade 4. The Oregon State-initiated performance assessment program (Khattri et al., 1998) is for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10. The Vermont State-initiated performance assessment program (Khattri et al., 1998) is for grades 4, 5 and 8. The Connecticut Science and Mathematics Assessment (Mitchell, 1992) and Mabry (1992) are both for high school students. Even the New Standards Project (NSP) (NCEE, 1997a, 1997c; Resnick & Simmons, 1993) are a set of performance assessment system and achievement standards that students at the end of fourth, eighth, and tenth grades should achieve.

Performance assessments at the district level are not so visible. Khattri et al. (1998) state that there has not been a comprehensive account of district-initiated performance assessment practices. So far, the list of districts that have developed their own district wide performance assessment programs is short. It includes districts such as San Diego City, California; South Brunswick, New Jersey; Frederick County, Maryland; Fort Worth, Texas; Prince William County, Virginia (all in Khattri et al., 1998); Austin Independent, Texas (Hoffman et al., 1998); Varona, Wisconsin (Pelavin Associates & CCSSO, 1991); and an early literacy portfolio documented in Salinger (1998). In fact, few school districts have actually undertaken the massive work of replacing existing standardized, multiple-choice tests with alternative assessments, e.g., performance assessments (Salinger, 1998). Nonetheless, it is believed that district level assessment reform takes a smaller scale effort (Khattri et al., 1998) and a full account of how school districts moved toward systemic use of alternative forms of assessment (Gomez, Graue, & Bloch, 1991; Lamme & Hysmith, 1991; Valencia, Hiebert, & Afflerbach, 1994) should

benefit those districts that plan to develop their own performance-based assessment program.

More importantly, additional data are needed to illustrate what is really happening in classrooms when performance assessments are implemented. The nature and complexity of what assessment information is collected from performance assessments and the extent to which the information obtained is useful and used by classroom teachers under specific circumstances needs to be documented and understood. After all, simply implementing performance assessments may not automatically improve teaching quality and/or learning outcomes. Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) warn that holistic scores obtained from performance assessments may not be instructionally informative. Even when teachers are provided with a standard-based scoring system they still use normative language to characterize student performance to norms (Pearson & DeStefano, 1993).

Several factors may affect the extent to which a performance assessment is informatively useful. First, the success of performance assessments may rely heavily upon teacher support and their "broad knowledge of curriculum, extensive repertoires of instructional strategies, and deep understandings of learners and learning" (Dorfman, 1997, p. 4; see also Darling-Hammond & Ancess, 1996; Wolf & Reardon, 1996).

Second, the design or the characteristics of the performance assessment program may also be crucial. Khattri et al. (1998) state that their data indicate different types of performance-based assessment tasks have different degrees of impact on teaching and learning. They conclude that assessment systems composed of portfolios or extended performance tasks tended to cause significant shifts in curriculum, whereas most sites

using on-demand assessment tasks exhibited only marginal impact on the classroom curriculum. Khattri et al. (1998) also hypothesize that the more the assessment is integrated with instruction the more likely the assessment can fulfill its pedagogical purposes, and the more students and teachers are involved in the assessment, the more likely the assessment can help reform teaching and learning in profound ways.

Third, studies of Salinger (1998) on an early literacy portfolio assessment program and Falk (1998) and Khattri et al. (1998) on the Primary Language Record/Primary Learning Record, indicate that the purpose(s) that an assessment program serves and the development stage of an assessment program may determine the type of information that teachers obtain and their use of the information. When an assessment program is newly developed and serves to align with an instructional reform, teachers tend to gather information to improve their assessment skills. On the other hand, when an assessment program is adopted by teachers who have had experience using the assessment methods and tasks, these teachers tend to collect information of students' learning needs to improve their instruction.

Intuitively, other factors such as grade levels, subject areas, teaching styles and teacher trust of the assessment may also affect the quantity and quality of data perceived and/or gathered by teachers and the extent to which the information is used. These factors and their working mechanisms all need to be further explored in classroom contexts.

Given the above concerns, the primary purpose of the present study is to document and understand the complexity of how teachers conducted a district-wide K-2 performance assessment program in language arts. The extent to which teachers varied in

their administration/implementation of the assessment and how they used information obtained from the assessments to adjust or plan their instruction is explored. Factors that seemed to affect teachers' information gathering and their uses of information are the major focus of the present study, for example, the assessment methods, and teachers' integration of the assessment program with their regular classroom instruction.

The research questions are:

1. How did the teachers' behavior/practice vary from District expectations in the administration of the K-2 Performance Assessment Program on reading and writing, and why?

2. What information did the teachers actually obtain, and how? To what extent was the information obtained limited to what was specified in evaluation rubrics?

3. How did the teachers use the assessment results? To what extent did the District use the assessment results for accountability purposes? To what extent did teachers use the assessment results for instructional purposes?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance Assessment

Introduction

The U. S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment (1992) broadly defines performance assessment as "testing that requires a student to create an answer or a product that demonstrates his or her knowledge or skills." More specifically, Khattri and Sweet (1996) define performance assessment as "a type of assessment that requires students to actually perform, demonstrate, construct, and develop a product or a solution under defined conditions and standards" (p. 3). Navarrete and Gustke (1996) state that "true performance assessments use students' previously acquired knowledge in solving problems and allow the learners to apply and transfer that knowledge in a variety of contexts" (p. 2). Thus, the features common in most definitions of performance assessment are that responses are created or constructed by the students, rather than chosen from presented options as in traditional multiple-choice tests (Rudner & Boston, 1994), and that performance assessment examines what knowledge and skills a student demonstrates, rather than just focusing on whether the student gets the right answer.

Performance assessments usually focus on examining the essence of the discipline(s) (García & Pearson, 1994) and items in performance assessments usually directly reflect the intended outcome rather than knowledge about the outcome (Rudner & Boston, 1994). Furthermore, performance assessments commonly rely heavily on the scorers' deliberate observations and professional judgment (Mehrens, 1992). When

teachers are involved in the evaluation of their own students' performance, Gipps (1994) believes performance assessments will affect teachers' professional development.

The purpose and use of performance assessments has been strongly debated. The National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST, 1992) suggests that states or local entities use performance assessments for system accountability. Rudner and Boston (1994) warn that when performance assessments are used for high-stakes purposes (e.g., graduation and program admission), corruptibility, motivation, equity, and psychometric issues arise. For example, teachers teach to the test (corruptibility), students seeing standards beyond their ability simply give up learning (motivation), the single set of goals and standards are not appropriate for poor school districts and students from diverse linguistic/cultural backgrounds (equity), and the generalizability and reliability of the outcome measured is limited (psychometric issues).

Performance assessments are not entirely new in American education. For years teachers have been assigning written reports, oral presentations, or art/science projects for teaching purposes and as a base for course grades. What is new is that, since the middle 1980s, performance assessments have been used for instructional and curricular purposes and have spread into accountability and certification on a large scale (Khattri & Sweet, 1996; Navarrete & Gustke, 1996). Khattri, Reeve, Kane, and Adamson (1995) report that performance assessments are currently used to support systematic state-, district-, or school-wide objectives such as "guiding changes in instruction and curriculum, monitoring student achievement toward desired outcomes, holding schools accountable for student achievement, and certifying student capabilities" (p. v). Smith and Cohen (1991) opine that performance assessments are not just the latest bandwagon or another

short-term fix but surely will have an impact on classrooms. Smith and Cohen contend that performance assessments examine the purpose of education, identify the skills of students, and empower teachers.

California spearheaded the trend with statewide open-ended mathematics assessments in the late 1980s, and Vermont followed with statewide portfolio assessments (Khattri et al., 1995). Kane and Mitchell (1996) report that more than 40 states have adopted performance assessments, especially in writing. García and Pearson (1994) indicate that performance assessments have permeated the school curriculum in Arizona, California, Maryland, Vermont, Kentucky, New York, etc. and other schools are pursuing performance assessments in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.

Formats

Generally speaking, any "student-constructed responses to comprehensive demonstrations or collections of work over time" are qualified tasks for performance assessments (Elliott, 1994). For example, Payne (1997) suggests a wide range of performance-based tasks, such as "essays, science experiments, physical demonstration, and portfolios . . ., photographic collections, problem solving games, audio or video tapes, computer shows, oral or written reports, drawings or diagrams, simulations, models, or constructed written responses to open-ended problems." On the other hand, Gipps (1994) believes that the aim of performance assessments is "to model the real learning activities" (p. 98), thus performance assessments should be carried out as part of normal classroom work rather than as on-demand tasks for assessment purposes.

Khattri et al. (1998) warn that the term, 'performance assessment,' has been used to describe "a very wide range of student testing instruments and systems" (p. 60). Seeing the necessity of distinguishing one performance assessment system from another, Khattri et al. (1998) propose a "sample-based conceptual framework of performance assessments." According to this framework, key characteristics of performance assessments are: assessment tasks (on-demand, extended, demonstrations, portfolios, and others), task dimensions (time demands, applied problem-solving skills demands, metacognitive demands, social competencies, student control, and relationships among the dimensions of assessment tasks), scoring method (generic scoring rubric, specific scoring ,structured observation), integration with instruction, linkages to (state, district, school) standards, level of prescription, and the scope of pedagogical net that the performance assessment program plans to cast.

The benefits of following Khattri et al. (1998) framework when one presents or documents a performance assessment are twofold. First, readers will be informed of 'exactly' what a performance assessment program really constitutes. Second, when effects of performance assessments on teaching (and/or learning) occurs, the specified characteristics of the assessment may provide sources for readers to trace the cause(s) and even to hypothesize. This is the framework that the present study follows to describe the performance assessment programs in the assessment literature.

Effects on Teaching

Flexer and Gerstner (1993) argue that the effects of alternative forms of assessment on teaching are as yet untested. They point out that, at best, the negative

evidence collected from research on the effects of traditional multiple-choice tests implies that alternative assessments can improve instruction. On the other hand, some believe that performance assessments "offer an alternative means for monitoring and documenting student progress" (Day, 1996), which may prompt changes in instructional content and methods in classrooms.

Advocates of performance assessments usually promise high consequential validity. Advocates believe assessment tasks are "a faithful reflection of intended and important learning outcomes, and can encourage a tendency to direct teaching towards higher order skills and processes" (see discussion in Gipps, 1994, p. 101). Gipps claims that certain characteristics of performance assessments can contribute to systemic validity (Frederiksen & Collins, 1989) through the directness and instructional value of the performance-based tasks. Gipps believes that through assessing cognitive skills directly, instead of through more abstract tasks, "teaching to the task will be teaching to the domain" (p. 102). Resnick and Resnick (1996) also maintain that direct measures provide an opportunity to display the higher-order thinking, effort in dealing with complexity, judgment, and uncertainty (L. B. Resnick, 1987) that teachers often seek to foster.

Nevertheless, in the discussion of ten dilemmas of performance assessment, Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) caution that standard-referenced information may not be instructionally useful. These authors maintain that teachers still tend to refer student performance to norms and fail to recognize the diagnostic information provided in the assessment results. Pearson, DeStefano, and García support a dimensional scoring system so that assessment results can be more informative but warn that when

dimensional scoring is used teachers might look for particular weakness of student performance.

In fact, it is because of the belief that "assessment is a lever for change in teaching and learning" (Mitchell, 1992), that large-scale performance assessments, such as the ones used in Arizona, Maryland, New York, and Connecticut, were implemented. The aim of these programs is to use assessments to reinforce the curriculum and instruction to a desired direction and to hold schools accountable for that achievement (Mitchell, 1992). In these programs, extended and integrative project-based assessment tasks were given, accompanied by matrix sampling (each time, e.g., any set of prompts, topics, and genres are equally possible to be chosen as an assessment item). It was the impossibility of predicting that gives assessments the power to change (Mitchell, 1992). For example, teachers had no choice but to model the sample prompts and provide project-based learning opportunities on all topics in all genres for all purposes to all students.

Furthermore, because of the accountability purposes of the large-scale performance assessment programs, scoring fairness is regarded as crucial. Thus, in these programs teachers do not usually grade their own students' work. Mitchell (1992) states, "In 1990, twenty-seven states used writing samples as part of their statewide assessments, but more than twenty of these states employed outside companies to grade the essays" (p. 39). In some programs, e.g., the California Assessment Program (CAP), students would not even receive a grade for their own work but each school would receive a scaled score.

It is clear that in these large-scale performance assessment programs only the scorers, not classroom teachers, are informed of student learning progress and problems.

It is difficult for teachers to make day-to-day decisions about what to teach and how to teach to maximize students' learning.

Because of the above considerations, large-scale performance assessments implemented mainly for accountability purposes, will not be further investigated. The present study focuses on performance assessment programs that are more likely to provide instructionally useful feedback to classroom K-2 teachers.

Information Gained

Borko et al. (1993) conducted yearlong intervention workshops to help 14 third-grade teachers develop and implement performance assessments in their classrooms. Regarding the information gained from the performance assessment, one teacher, "Abby," reported that by listening to students read, talking to students, and asking direct questions (e.g., "What did you do to get to this point? Why did you do that? What might you do next?") (Herman, Aschbacher, & Winters, 1992, p. 116), she obtained information to determine what her students knew and could do in reading. For another teacher, "Jackie", conferencing with students provided her information about the affective component of her students' reading. She usually asked herself, "Are they enjoying the book?" The same teacher reported that through observing students engaged in activities, she found out what her students needed to complete a task and how successful the students were with that task. More explicitly, Jackie commented,

> "I think it [new types of assessment] gives us insight into the student's thinking and learning, more so than just a score or plus number. So I think what we have done with the project has really taught us what process did they follow . . . I think I know more about my students and where they're coming from than just are they right or wrong" (p. 12).

Herman et al. (1992) propose that, through analyzing process information collected from performance assessments, teachers can look for patterns related to outcomes and gain valuable information about how to help students improve. Herman et al. suggest that teachers ask themselves the following questions:

1. Did successful students approach the task in significantly different ways from less successful students?
2. What kinds of misconceptions did the poor performers hold and how might these be related to deep misunderstanding of what was taught?
3. What kinds of errors did poor performers make?
4. Where in the process of completing a task did students have difficulty?

This indicates that disciplined procedures are needed for teachers to capture the information revealed from performance assessments. Herman et al. (1992) suggest that a longitudinal approach that puts assessment results into perspective combined with multiple measures of the same outcomes should provide a more complete picture of student achievement.

Factors Affecting Information Gathering

Teacher intuition may play an important role in the practice of gathering information from assessments. For example, Flexer, Cumbo, Borko, Mayfield, and Marion (1995) conducted a study of 14 third-grade teachers. In that study, although teachers admitted that observations and exchanges with students were valuable sources of information, teachers did not consider these two as assessment instruments. These teachers felt that they trusted their intuition better and that "they watched children carefully enough each day to know exactly who knew what and what difficulties they were having" (p. 26).

Student behavior may also affect teacher evaluation of students' performance or work. Gipps, Brown, McCallum, and McAlister (1995) report that six out of their 31 primary-grade teachers resisted criterion-referenced approaches and incorporated children's effort into their final grades because, for those teachers, "achievement and effort are both relevant constructs" (p. 180). Brookhart (1993) also reports a similar finding in teacher grading practices.

On the other hand, Gipps et al. (1995) report that some teachers, whose assessment approach was intuitive and child-centered at the beginning, became more evidence-oriented after they experienced using attainment criteria to assess their students' performance. For example, these teachers collected and went through students' work samples when they assigned grades and they also became more aware of the importance of observation and interviewing their students.

Gipps et al. (1995) also report that 10 out of their 31 teachers, who had been planning their assessments systematically, were observed either giving concentrated time for assessment or integrating the assessment with regular classroom work while they circulated around the classroom to gather performance evidence, through, for example, observation, taking notes, collecting working samples, and questioning students. These teachers "see real value in continuous, formative assessment as enhancing their professional development and effectiveness as teachers" (p. 183).

Teachers' Uses of Information Obtained

A Study of the National Curriculum assessment program for 7-year-olds (year 2) in England and Wales conducted by Gipps, McCallum, McAlister, and Brown (1992)

documented teachers' positive use of information obtained from the assessment. For example, 1) teachers' attention to the curriculum and expectations to students; 2) emphasis on basic skills, e.g., spelling, punctuation and mental arithmetic; 3) more practical math and science work; and 4) introduction of group and individual work (Gipps et al.). Gipps (1994) also documented that teachers' coming together to discuss performance standards or criteria is somewhat personally and professionally unthreatening and has become a process of teacher development, which creates impacts on their teaching (see the Vermont study of Koretz, Stecher, & Diebert, 1992).

Borko et al. (1993) indicate that teacher knowledge, beliefs, and practices have been gradually changed because of teacher participation and experience in incorporating performance assessments in their classrooms. Borko et al. report that teachers started to consider an array of activities (e.g., running records and written summaries) as new forms of assessment, and teachers seemed to have greater understanding and insights about below-grade-level students' skills.

On the other hand, Clift, Weiner, and Wilson (1981), Gipps, Steadman, Goldstein, and Stierer (1983), and Gipps et al. (1995) concluded that, although assessment results are passed up, they are little used either within primary schools or in primary-secondary transfer. Gipps et al. (1995) utilized three models of assessment approaches to demonstrate patterns of teacher use and non-use of assessment results. The three models that Gipps et al. (1995) abstracted from their data through a variety of research methods are as follows: (1) Intuitives (passive resisters of criterion-referenced systems) who criticize systematic assessments for interfering with their 'real' teaching, would rather rely upon their intuition and memory of what children can do, and find it difficult to

'distill' attainment from attitudinal, biographical, and contextual data; (2) evidence gathers who accommodate assessment within their normal classroom teaching, collect evidence of children's attainment from a variety of sources when 'assessment opportunities' arise, and view assessment as summative, rather than formative, in nature; and (3) systematic planners who are very familiar with assessment procedures and attainment targets, plan for ongoing formative assessment systematically as part of teaching practice, use varied assessment techniques ("planned observation, open-ended questioning, teacher-pupil discussion, running records and serendipitously unplanned observation . . . scrutiny of class work, notes of critical incidents, annotated pieces of work, annotated photographs and self-designed worksheets" p. 43), and use assessment as a diagnostic and formative tool to plan for their teaching.

According to Gipps et al. (1995), intuitives did not seriously consult assessment results passed on and saw the assessment process as no more than a laborious chore. Thus, intuitives attached more importance to their colleagues' comments about children than to recorded results--"while the assessment results were useful, these teachers wanted more than the 'objective' results, they wanted subjective information from the previous teacher about individual children's character" (p. 183). Evidence gatherers used the assessment results mainly to check for teaching content that teachers of the previous year had covered. (Some teachers of the next year may decide not to repeat topics that have been covered, while some may decide to repeat or revise the topics and then reassess the students.) These teachers did not use the results to check children's performance for themselves but for report purposes. Systematic planners made more conscious use of results passed up. For example, they consulted the assessment results to check children's

achievement level to plan their activities and grouping--"These teachers initially trusted the judgments made by the previous class teachers and did not consciously reassess the children when they came into their classes"(p. 134). Gipps et al. conclude that only the systematic planers can be said to have been using the results in a way that shows trusts in the judgment of colleagues and leads to progressive planning.

Overall, there is not much literature regarding teachers' use of assessment results in classroom contexts. Even Gipps et al. (1995) study mainly emphasizes how the assessment information was passed on to the next year's teacher. The Details and rationale of possible uses of assessment results, such as guiding and eventually improving teaching techniques (e.g., in Khattri et al., 1995) and other aspects (e.g., interaction with individual students and communication with parents) need to be understood.

Empirical Studies of Performance Assessment Programs for Young Children

Several school and district level K-2 (and K-4) performance assessments on language arts are reviewed below. I use the conceptual framework of performance assessment provided by Khattri et al. (1998) to introduce each program (when information is available). I focus on how the assessment program was implemented, how the information was obtained from the assessment programs, and how teachers used the information. Discussion of applications to the present study and brief critics are presented at the end of each study.

The Work Sampling System

The Work Sampling System (WSS), founded by Samuel J. Meisels, is a performance assessment system for students in preschool through the fifth grade (Dorfman, 1997). This comprehensive assessment program replaces the use of readiness and early school achievement tests for young children, such as the California Achievement Test, the Metropolitan Readiness or Achievement Tests, the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Meisels, 1993). The WSS is an integrated part of the teaching/learning process to "assess and document children's skills, knowledge, behavior, and accomplishments as displayed across a wide variety of classroom learning domains and as performed on multiple occasions" (Meisels, 1993, p. 36).

The WSS consists of three complementary components: (1) developmental checklists, (2) portfolios, and (3) summary reports. Based on national, state, and local curriculum standards, the developmental checklists provide a rationale and illustrations to assist teachers in observing and documenting individual children's growth and progress on seven domains: personal/social development, language and literacy, mathematical thinking, scientific thinking, social studies, art and music, and physical development.

The portfolio component is a purposeful collection of children's work over time on multiple domains on multiple occasions. Teachers usually involve children in choosing the content and judging the quality of work. The summary report, the final component of the WSS, summarizes the child's performance. This overall judgment is based on the teacher's review of each child's checklist and portfolio. Teachers are

required to reflect on and comment about whether the child is developing and/or progressing as expected in terms of the WSS.

Dorfman (1997) conducted a study about the connection between the implementation of the WSS and teachers' professional development in a K-5 elementary school located in a small town in the Midwest. Half of the 22 school teaching staff (two kindergarten, four first-grade, three second-grade, and three third-grade) voluntarily participated the project in the school year of 1993-94. The driving force behind the teachers' participation, according to Dorfman, was to be engaged in "new ways of thinking" and "cutting-edge practices" rather than to search for "more acceptable methods of assessment" (p. 58).

Based on the "sample-based conceptual framework of performance assessment," proposed by Khattri et al. (1998), curriculum-embedded (rather than on-demand tasks) and portfolio assessments were used in this WSS. Dorfman reported that teachers' observation and collection of children's work were the two major elements of WSS but did not specify the task dimensions of the curriculum-embedded tasks (for example, their time demands, problem-solving skills demands, metacognitive demands, interpersonal skills demands, and students' judgment demands) in each of the seven assessment domains mentioned above.

The scoring methods used in WSS were teachers' structured observation of students' classroom behavior and teachers' evaluation of students' work based on the guidelines of the checklists. Neither generic nor specific scoring rubrics seemed to be used. WSS was thoroughly integrated into classroom activities and instruction, required students' and teachers' involvement (i.e., the "pedagogical net" was wide), and was

closely aligned with the state, district, and school curricular guidelines. Although teachers did not have a high degree of control over task specification, scoring methods/procedures, or assessment implementation procedures/timelines (these were prescribed by WSS), teachers were seen to evaluate their own students' portfolios, diagnose children's learning needs, monitor their progress, and plan their instructional and curricular strategies.

Khattri et al. (1998) hypothesize that the more a performance assessment is integrated with instruction, involves teachers and students on a daily basis, and leaves teachers room to use the assessment in ways that makes sense to them pedagogically, the more likely that the performance assessment will inform instruction and is more pedagogically useful.

According to Dorfman (1997), since no grades or rankings were assigned by teachers in WSS, and students' performance was evaluated based on grade level expectations, teachers reported a marked reduction in competition and increase in cooperation among students. A third-grade teacher ("Emily") felt that she paid more attention to what her students had achieved than to ranking their performance.

On the other hand, there seemed to be a conflict between the mandated curricular requirements (based on textbooks and workbooks) and the approach of WSS (an developmental approach). A kindergarten teacher ("Sue") complained that the information that WSS provided was too general. She wanted to know "which letters the children recognized, how far they could count, what colors they knew, and other discrete skills" (pp. 158-9). Another kindergarten teacher ("Ann") said that WSS did not address her program.

A third-grade teacher ("Dale") did not agree. He said that when he used the WSS to "study his children" and "really analyze them" (p. 163), the curriculum and WSS fit. "Dale" said that he attended to how children solve problems instead of their acquisition of mathematics facts. That is, he shifted his focus from curriculum to the learner. A third-grade teacher ("Katie") said she observed her students based on the guidelines of checklists, which shifted her curricular strategies from teaching isolated skills to engaging students in hands-on activities and open-ended problem solving.

Many teachers reported that individual focus through the summarization process of WSS was a support for teachers to look closely at students' work and their ways of learning and to think carefully about individual students' learning needs and progress. "Sue" (a kindergarten teacher) reported that WSS broadened her repertoire of what constituted evidence of student development and learning through listening to their conversations, watching them play, and interacting with materials.

In summary, alignment of curriculum and the performance assessment program seemed to be necessary for the teachers to recognize the assessment as an instructionally useful tool, rather than a bureaucratic burden. More importantly, only when a performance assessment capture details of individual student day-to-day learning situations, rather than factual learning outcomes, can the performance assessment be more likely to inform instruction.

The New Standards Project

The New Standards Project (NSP) co-directed by Lauren Resnick of the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh and Marc Tucker of the

National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) was launched in 1991 and came to a conclusion in the summer of 1997. The NSP's work include establishing 1) national performance standards in English language arts, mathematics, science and applied learning at the elementary (fourth grade), middle (eighth grade), and high school (tenth grade) levels; and 2) a performance assessment system which include reference examinations (traditional test items and performance tasks) and a portfolio system (classroom work and extended projects) to tie to the standards. It was reported that twenty-two states and six cities were partners of the NSP in 1997. The NSP was not funded by the federal government but by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the John D. and Catherine T. Foundation, and dues through state and city partners (Khattri et al., 1998; NCEE, 1997a; Resnick & Resnick, 1996).

Noakes Elementary School (Anton School District, Iowa) participated the NSP in 1992 and piloted numerous NSP mathematics and English language arts assessment tasks and English language arts portfolios (Khattri et al., 1998). Specifically, NSP mathematics tasks require students to solve mathematical problems, explain the methods they used, and their reason(s) of choosing the methods. For example, a fourth grade mathematics task was to ask students to decide the number and kinds of fish to purchase based on the amount of money they had, the space of the aquarium, and the special needs of the fish. Fourth grade NSP language arts tasks would require students to read a text, answer questions about the text (the first day), draft an essay related to the topic of the text (the second day), discuss their own essay with others in a small group (the third day), and revise the essay (the fourth day). During the four days, teachers were allowed to give instructions, prompts, and advice as students wrote their essay. Finally, fourth grade

English language arts portfolios that each student must complete contained: 1) a table of contents; 2) a reflection piece; 3) a response to literature; 4) some pieces to show efforts in reading; and 5) four free choices.

Khattri et al. (1998) did not specify Noakes Elementary's purpose of participating the NSP but state that the school is "an enthusiastic participant in the district's assessment reform efforts" (p. 214). Three types of "assessment tasks" (Khattri et al.) were used in Noaks Elementary: on-demand and extended performance-based assessment tasks, and portfolios. Scoring rubrics were tailored to specific tasks in each subject area. The NSP Portfolios were usually integrated into daily instructions while on-demand and extended performance tasks were not. Teachers in Noakes were not required to follow the NSP portfolio guidelines but had individual control over how they developed and used the portfolios. It was not clear in Khattri et al. but presumably teachers were required to follow the NSP procedural guidelines when assessing on-demand and extended performance-based tasks. Students' work on on-demand and extended assessment tasks were not graded by their own classroom teachers but "teams of teachers trained to score papers objectively" (NCEE, 1977b, p. 8). The "pedagogical net" (Khattri et al.) that the NSP portfolios cast were wide but the one cast by on-demand and extended performance tasks was narrow because the latter did not require teachers to collect data over time.

Overall, teachers in Noakes Elementary reported the pedagogical value of the NSP. For example, the teachers valued performance tasks as "valuable learning experience that students enjoyed" (p. 215), which help students gain a deep understanding of the subject matter and retain information. Khattri et al. (1998) did not document much about the instructional information that teachers gained from the NSP,

except indicating that some teachers reported that portfolios demonstrated what students know, reflected on students' progress and their ownership of their work. It was unknown how teachers would use this information to plan or adjust their following instruction.

The Early Literacy Portfolio

Salinger (1998) explores the effects (or "consequential validity" or "backwash") of a district-developed early literacy portfolio program ("the portfolios") on K-2 instructional practices and teachers' attitudes toward teaching, learning and early literacy content. According to Salinger (1998), what had motivated the assessment reform in the district is "Movement in the early childhood grades toward instruction that would be less didactic and more attuned to children's capabilities and needs" (p. 185). Specifically, in order to align the instruction that emphasized "identification of the skills, strategies and background experiences students brought to school" (p. 185) and to build upon these strengths, in the school year of 1987-8, a group of teachers in the district initiated the early literacy portfolio program ("the portfolios") to replace a district-wide standardized test which was administered for all first graders. The portfolio program was to provide teachers with a mechanism to "document progress of every child [and] provide data to support and inform decisions about daily teaching" (p. 193).

The core contents or "assessment tasks" (Khattri et al., 1998) of this early literacy portfolio program include: 1) portfolio: collections of writing samples (daily writing or journal entries), sight word inventories, yearly self portrait, higher-order thinking/comprehension inventory; 2) on-demand tasks: Concepts about Print test (Clay, 1979), story retellings, oral reading records (Clay, 1985), and a spelling activity in which

students spell twelve words 'as best they can;' and 3) interview: interviews with parents and students. Besides the core contents (which were the same district-wide), teacher may include other documents to portrait the students' learning progress; thus, the assessment program was "moderately prescribed". It seems that the "scope of pedagogical net" of the portfolios was wide because the assessment program require students' and teachers' involvement and samples from different sub-domain was sampled. Yet, Salinger (1998) did not provide details of the core contents or assessment tasks or how information was obtained from each of the assessment tasks; thus, the "dimensions of task specification" (Khattri et al., 1998) of each task and the extent to which the assessment program was integrated into instruction is unknown.

Teachers used a "generic scoring rubric" (Khattri et al., 1998), called "the emergent literacy scale" ("the scale"), to grade students' "portfolios" (containing the above three types of assessment tasks). The six-point scale describes six stages of district standards on "children's strategies and abilities to make sense of and with print" (p. 189): 1 point for "Early Emergent," 2 points for "Advanced emergent," 3 points for "Early Beginning Reading"," 4 points for "Advanced Beginning reader," 5 points for "Early Independent Reader," and 6 points for "Advanced Independent Reader". The district expects that most children will progress through the six stages through kindergarten entry through the completion of second grade. The scale is also used for district-wide accountability to summarize each student's literacy growth. Teachers used the scale at the middle and end of each school year. Yet, as the teachers tried to accommodate the considerable time demanded by the portfolios, teachers gradually integrated their data collection practices into their classroom routines. In general, teachers did not have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

control over task specification, scoring methods, or timeline but seemed to be given considerable flexibility on data collection procedures.

After three years of the implementation of the early literacy portfolio assessment program, sixty-three of the sixty-four primary teachers in the district's seven elementary teachers were interviewed. The purpose was to investigate the effects of portfolios and the use of the emergent literacy scales on teachers' thoughts and practices (Jones and Chittenden, in press; Salinger, 1995, 1998). Almost all teachers reported that the portfolios helped them "monitor and evaluate children's progress . . . through confirmation of hunches or the provision of specific evidence about students' performance" (p. 194, Salinger, 1998). The portfolios also provided teachers with "a way of keeping track of students' progress over time" (p. 194) which helped teachers to perceive a wide range of learning patterns of students and to recognize students' learning needs.

Salinger (1998) reports that the use of the emergent literacy scale resulted in the following effects on teachers' instruction and decision-making with various degrees. First, remarkably few teachers (about 10 percent) said or implied that the scale supported their instructional decisions. Rarely, some teachers mentioned that the scale alerted them things that they could work on some students or to fine tune their instruction and that students' point on the scale helped them make decision about grouping. Salinger (1998) suggests that there was an 'systemic level' of connection between the portfolios and instruction--

> "This does not mean that instruction did not benefit from the portfolio approach; but the connection was at a more systemic level in that the entire process of developing the portfolio, changing instructional emphasis, collecting portfolio documentation and then evaluating the contents of the portfolio periodically had

> brought about a change in teachers' way of 'doing school', rather than in the process of making discrete, individual decisions" (p. 195).

Second, about twenty-two percent of the teachers said or implied that the scale score (accompanied with students' work samples) enabled them to discuss individual students with the next year's teacher (who shared the special language and understandings about the scale). Third, twenty-three percent of the teachers said or implied that they depended on the scale to provide a systematic and standardized way of confirming or enhancing their evaluation of students' work. Salinger (1998) suggests that teachers were experiencing a self-concept role shift and started to see their responsibility (e.g., data analysts) in the assessment program. Fourth, most frequently (more than twenty-five percent), teachers said or implied that the scale provide indications of student patterns of literacy development as they referenced student work against the scale.

In addition, teachers made some comments about their use of the scale. Teachers indicated that they started seeing some subtle aspects of literacy development which were performed by students but were not specified in the scale as teachers compared students' work against the scale.

Salinger (1998) concludes that, on the whole, the portfolios did not cause teachers to adopt "a more reflective stance toward their students or their decision-making" or to go beyond inquiring "students' attainment of specific strategies of levels of development" (p. 198). Nonetheless, Salinger (1998) believes that the portfolios had indeed helped teachers embrace and operationalize "a way of thinking about students, instruction, and assessment" (p. 198).

Two valid points made in Salinger's (1998) study need to be pointed out. First, information obtained from an assessment may not be used for making individual or discrete decisions but for teachers' global consideration of teaching. Second, uses of an assessment program and the information obtained may change only teacher practices on assessment (rather than general aspects of teaching).

Nonetheless, there are a number of limits to Salinger's (1998) study. First, only teacher interview data (instead of classroom observation data) were analyzed. Second, core contents of the portfolios needed to be specified (so that the procedure of data gathering and information of task dimension, e.g., time and metacognitive demands, can be revealed). Third, the conclusion made from this study, in which the assessment did not plan to 'drive' district instructional reforms, maybe should not be applied to the situations where assessment programs are used as leverage to reform instruction.

Primary Language Records and Primary Learning Records

The Primary Language Record (PLR), developed in England and piloted in California and throughout New York City, provides teachers with a structured assessment method and framework to document young children's academic development followed by individualized instruction to meet students' learning needs. The Primary Language Record (PLR) tracks children's language and literacy skills, and Primary Learning Record (PLeR) tracks all subject areas. Implementation of the PLR and PLeR was facilitated by the New York City Assessment Network (NYAN), "a consortium of education organizations dedicated to supporting the use of performance assessments by New York City teachers" (Khattri et al., 1998, p. 182).

In PLR/PLeR, student development in various aspects of learning (e.g., writing, speaking, listening, and mathematics) is systematically observed and documented in a reporting form based on multiple forms of evidence from multiple perspectives--teachers, parents and students themselves. Component of the PLR/PLeR may include focused interviews with students and their families (to provide teachers with a full picture of students' development), conferences the child (for students to discuss their learning experiences, achievements, and interests, and learning progress), narrative reports (based on day-to-day samples of student work, teachers' summative observations), end of year comments from the child and his/her families (to review the student's work over the year), information for the student's next teacher (to provide continuous information about the student), and rating scales (to view individual students' growth on a continuum of progress) (Falk, 1994, 1998; Khattri et al., 1998).

Drawing upon a series of studies as the PLR was implemented in New York City public elementary schools (Falk, 1995; Falk & Darling-Hammond, 1993; Falk, MacMurdy, & Darling-Hammond, 1995), California (Barr & Cheong, 1993; Barr & Syverson, 1994; Miserlis, 1993; Wilson & Adams, 1992), and the United Kingdom (Centre for Language in Learning, 1990, 1995; Feeney & Hann, 1991; O'Sullivan, 1995), Falk (1998) reports how the PLR supports teaching.

Falk (1998) indicates that detailed observations of students across natural learning contexts combined with students' work samples, demonstrates "what students know and can do . . . and students' approaches toward their learning" (p.157). This 'concrete' evidence of student learning then becomes a foundation for teachers to individualize their instruction. One teacher said whatever conclusions she came to about a student was

always "grounded in an observation or a piece of work" (p. 157). A special education teachers reported that keeping track of a struggling ESL student's progress helped her "identify [the student's] learning strategies, the specific competencies he was mastering in reading and writing, as well as areas in which he demonstrated strength" (p. 158). Seeing beyond student problems, this special education teacher then wrote specific instructional recommendations for other teachers to further support student learning needs.

The reading scales in PLR is a scoring mechanism that outlines a full range of strategies, stages, and skills of literacy proficiency that young children from age five to eight are able to do. Teachers use the reading scale as a conceptual framework to understand, observe, discuss (with colleagues and parents), and determine levels of students' literacy development. In addition, the scale numbers assigned to students can be aggregated to report students' literacy development to the communities for accountability purposes (Falk, 1994).

Khattri et al. (1998; also in Khattri et al., 1995) also documented an elementary school, Park Elementary School (pre K-6), in New York City where the Primary Language Record (PLR) and later Primary Learning Record (PLeR) were implemented in the 1994-5 school year. Khattri et al. (1998) did not provide much detail about what information was actually obtained from the PLR/PLeR (which was documented in Falk 1994 and 1998 as above) but focused on the impact of the PLR/PLeR on curriculum, instruction and teacher role. Nonetheless, the documentation of Park Elementary School in Khattri et al. (1998; also in Khattri et al., 1995) does provide information about the

characteristics of the PLR/PLeR, according to the framework these authors provided. Framework of the PLR/PLeR was not clearly described in Falk (1994, 1998).

Khattri et al. (1998; also in Khattri et al., 1995) documented that about half of the teachers in Park Elementary School implemented the PLR/PLeR voluntarily in their classroom to help them understand and keep track of students' learning styles to tailor their instruction. Most teachers at Park Elementary said that they had already been using the procedures prescribed in the PLR/PLeR before they actually participated the program. Two types of assessment tasks, portfolio and curriculum-embedded activities, were used (although one may argue that conferencing with parents and students is another type of assessment task). Generic scoring rubrics were used. The PLR/PLeR was fully integrated into daily teaching practices but did not seem to directly link with specific state, district, or school curricular guidelines. The PLR/PLeR was "loosely prescribed" in Park Elementary School, where teachers chose voluntarily to participate the program and they did not use the PLR/PLeR uniformly. Teachers were free to decide how to document their observations and whom to observe and how often. The PLR/PleR was mainly a record of students' learning maintained by and for the teacher. Completed PLR/PLeR forms were not submitted to any supervisor. The PLR/PLeR cast a wide "pedagogical net" in that teachers may need to collect data at several points in time on a wide variety of skills and competencies.

Compared to the themes (information obtained from the assessment program/raging scales and the use of the information) concluded in Salinger (1998) study, it seems that teachers in the PLR/PLeR obtained more procedural information of their students (e.g., learning approach and strategies) than teachers in the early literacy

portfolio assessment program which focused on specific evidence of student learning and growth over time. This may be because different assessment tasks were emphasized: portfolio in the early literacy portfolio and observations in the PLR/PLeR.

It also seems that teachers in the PLR/PLeR were actually using the assessment program as a instructional tool (e.g., to individualize their instruction and to write specific instructional recommendation for other teachers), while teachers in the early literacy portfolio were mainly using the information they obtained from the assessment to improve their assessment skills (e.g., to monitor students' progress and to identify ranges of students' learning patterns). This may be because teachers in the early literacy portfolio were at the early stage of implementing the assessment to align with their curricular reform, while teachers in the PLR/PLeR were just fine tuning their use of the assessment to meet their instructional needs.

To conclude, it seems that the type of assessment tasks can decide the information obtained from the assessment and purposes of assessment and stages of implementation may also change the use of the information.

Summary

Performance assessments require students to actually construct solution(s) under defined conditions and standards. Performance assessments may have different formats but they basically consist of assessment tasks and scoring methods. Performance assessments can vary according to assessment tasks, scoring methods, and the degree to which the assessment integrates with instruction, links with mandated standards, and is controlled by local educational agencies.

The information that teachers obtained from performance assessments are student knowledge and skill levels, thinking processes, problem-solving approaches and strategies, learning needs, and progress over time.

Teachers usually use the information obtained from the assessment to adjust or plan interaction with students, curricula, teaching content and pedagogy, and their teaching beliefs. Some teachers reported that they used the assessment information to communicate with their colleagues, to confirm or enhance their evaluation of student performance, and to shift their role from teachers to assessors.

However, the information obtained from the assessment may not affect teaching but result in improving teacher assessment skills and global consideration of teaching. Factors that seem to affect teacher practices of gathering information from the assessment and their use of it may include teacher intuition, student behavior, and characteristics of the performance assessment program (e.g., purpose and development stages of the assessment, and assessment tasks).

All the above are valuable findings which in the present study, oriented questions in the field, data analysis, and sensitivity about some characteristics of teachers and the performance assessment program. These findings are also valuable as secondary data sources and may validate the findings of the present study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Naturalistic Inquiry

This study employs a qualitative research methodology to collect and analyze empirical data. The data consist of the procedural details and rationale of teacher use of a K-2 performance assessment program. The rationale for selecting a qualitative research methodology is: (1) I seek a holistic perspective to study details of a complex assessment program in a real-world situation rather than to manipulate the setting or to test theoretically derived hypotheses (Patton 1990); (2) I seek to capture personal perspectives and experiences through direct contacts with the people under study (Patton, 1990); (3) I attempt to analyze tacit knowledge (besides prepositional knowledge) and the nuances of multiple realities (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985); and (4) I intend to place the findings in a social and temporal context (Patton, 1990).

The design of the present study follows the framework of naturalistic inquiry proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). First, given the highly interrelated and interdependent relationship among assessment, instruction, curricula, teachers, and students, I intend to explore the K-2 performance assessment program as a whole by focusing on the interrelated details of the assessment program itself and teacher practices and perspectives in conducting assessments, gathering information, and using the information in natural settings.

During the course of this study, I attempt to be situationally responsive. I employ my tacit knowledge to key into potentially important information deliberately and

systematically under the guidance provided by four experienced mentors, faculty committee members. Three qualitative methods are employed in this study: interviews, observations, and document analysis.

Second, I attempt to maximize variations in the information (instead of focusing on similarities in order to generalize) during the process of sampling. The sampling stops when there is informational redundancy. I employ inductive analysis to make sense of field data. The theories and/or hypotheses obtained from literature reviews are not used as variables to be tested but to stimulate my "theoretical sensitivity" (what to look for in data sampling and analysis) (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), to generate questions, and to validate the accuracy or significance of my findings.

In the present study, grounded theory methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) has been used during data collection and data analysis to generate insights, hypotheses, and questions which led to further data collection and analysis. Thus, although an initial design of the study exists, the actual study is emerged through the "mutual shapings" between context and me.

Third, given the serious proposition that context is important in assigning meaning to data, the findings (facts and interpretation) of this study are subject to scrutiny by the participants. This is to meet a major criteria of trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985); that is, credibility.

This report will provide description of multiple realities to orient readers' transferability judgments. I admit that the report is based on my ideographic interpretation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of a specific context at specific time. Thus, when I make statements about transferability for the findings of this study, I will also supply

information about the studied site. The final judgment of transferability of this study to other sites is subject to the person who seeks to make the transfer.

Field Entry

In the summer of 1996, I visited a Midwest school district ("Adams" School District) to investigate the possibility of researching their ESL education with primary-age children. This district was selected because it was located in a campus town of an internationally known university, which I assumed would have a large population of children of international students and faculty and might have experimented with some ESL programs. I was interested in ESL programs because I hold a master's degree on TESL, (Teaching of English as a Second Language). I was particularly interested in education of K-2 children because of my previous research experiences.

I first met the Director of the district bilingual education. She informed me of the district's newly implemented assessment program on language arts and mathematics in grades K-2. The Director referred me to two administrators of the district Research Office who had developed and managed the K-2 performance assessment program.

These two administrators welcomed my interest in conducting a research project on the fairness of the program in assessing ESL young children. I submitted my research proposal to the College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee. After the Committee approved my proposal, I submitted a formal proposal to the district and it was approved immediately.

The district recommended an elementary school with a large group of ESL students, but the school declined the study because the Principal was afraid that the

teachers might be distracted from a language arts project called "Project Read." The district then recommended another elementary school ("Washington" School) which also had many ESL students. I met with the Principal and he welcomed my study. The Principal introduced me to the ESL coordinator of the school. I met with the ESL coordinator briefly. She promised to ask around to see which K-2 teachers would like to participate in the study.

On January 9, 1997 I arranged a lunch meeting at "Washington School" with the ESL coordinator and the four classroom teachers who had expressed their willingness to participate to the ESL coordinator. I briefly explained to the teachers my research purpose and what I would do in their classroom. At the end, I gave the teachers a copy of my research proposal and arranged a schedule of classroom observation with each one of them. The meeting lasted about 30 minutes.

I began to visit the four classrooms regularly on January 14, 1997 and planned to quickly concentrate on only one or two classrooms. It turned out that I visited all four classrooms throughout the time. I observed that these four teachers had quite different teaching styles, and the way they used and collected data from the assessment were also different. I believed that I could learn more about the assessment program and teachers' use of it by comparing and contrasting these four classrooms.

After one month, I realized that I needed to learn more about the assessment program and the way teachers used it before I could study the fairness of the program in assessing ESL students. I discussed this concern with the district and obtained their approval to change my research focus. I then submitted a research proposal to my preliminary examination committee regarding the study of the effects of the K-2

performance assessment program on K-2 teaching. I started collecting data about how the assessment was used and the effects of the assessment on classroom teaching.

Nonetheless, the committee did not agree that the study of "effects" was well thought out because I did not have data to show what had happened before the assessment program was implemented. Later, the committee recommended that I pursue the present topic which only focused on what teachers gained from the assessment and their use of the assessment results.

The Site

The District

"Adams" School District was located in a urbanized university town in the Midwest. About 54 percent of the population who were 20 years and over held a bachelor degree or higher (state average was 17 percent; national average was 19 percent). Per capita income in 1989 was $18,815 (state average was $14,154; national level was $14,420). About 81 percent of the population were White, 9 percent Black, 7 percent Asian/Pacific islander, and 2.3 percent Hispanic (State Department of Education, 1998)

The district included 20 elementary schools, 7 middle schools, 5 high schools, and one adult education school. There were 15,801 students enrolled in grades K-12 in 1997-8. Pupil/Teacher ratio was 24.2 (increase from 19.9 in 1996-7). About 17.5 percents of students received free or reduced lunch (State Department of Education, 1998).

The School

Washington School is a K-5 elementary school. Total enrollment was about 450 students in the 1997-8 school year. The number of students in each classroom was between 24-26. The ethnic breakdown of student enrollment was: Caucasian/Other 72 %, African American 17%, Asian 9%, and Hispanic 2%. There were about 3 to 10 ESL students in each classroom. The school was Summary Accredited by the State Board of Education. Summary Accreditation means that 51% - 65% or more of the students had scored above satisfactory level in two of the last three consecutive years on the state standardized test.

Participants

Four teachers, their students in one kindergarten, two first-grade, and one second-grade classroom, and two district administrators voluntarily participated in this research project. The four teachers were the primary participants. The kindergarten teacher was in her first year of teaching while the second-grade teacher was about to retire, and the two other teachers were mid-career (one of them is nationally certified). All of the teachers supported this project and were willing to provide insights or clarification about their teaching and their students.

The K-2 Performance Assessment Program

The K-2 performance assessment program was gradually introduced from 1991 to 1994 after some massive changes in district outcomes, curriculum, and instructional

standards in language arts and mathematics. According to the district *Primary Performance Assessment Handbook: K-2* ("the Handbook," guidelines for teachers to conduct K-2 performance assessments), the need for the K-2 performance assessment program is twofold. First, the first-grade "California Achievement Test" (CAT) needed to be replaced. In 1988, first-grade teachers petitioned that CAT was not "appropriate" for first-grade students and was not useful in obtaining information that teachers needed. The district then worked with teachers to look for an assessment system where the teachers could obtain information from their students and the district could monitor student achievement. Second, the achievement gap between African-American students and other sub-groups needed to be closed. District data in 1984 showed that African-American students achieved far less than other sub-groups. The district committed itself to close this "dramatic discrepancy" by the year 2000. The district needed an assessment system that had clear learning targets, criteria, and assessment information for teachers to plan appropriate instructional interventions "to prevent or close the gap" in early elementary schooling (Adams Public Schools, 1995/6).

A performance assessment program was chosen. The district felt that teachers were the best assessors of their students and teachers should benefit the most from the data obtained through the assessment. The district believed that the information would help teachers "identify what students know and understand and where understanding breaks down . . . to align the curriculum and instructions with students' needs" (Adams Public Schools, 1995/6, p. 1).

The district encouraged teachers to use multiple sources to assess students performance based on "routine behaviors over time, not just on a single interview or

worksheet . . . 'solid knowledge' that has been demonstrated over time in a variety of contexts." The district prescribed four assessment methods: observation, structured interview, portfolio, and a student's self-assessment.

The assessment outcomes reflected the attainment defined in the district curriculum. That is, the outcomes measured in the K-2 Performance Assessment Program were learning/skills that ALL students are expected to master ("routinely at an independent level") at the end of the year.

The cross-grade continuum/rubric in reading and writing were provided to help teachers identify students' specific and overall reading and writing skills, especially when a student's performance was below or beyond the grade level. This continuum/rubric also reflected the content of the summary reported to parents regarding each student reading and writing ability.

Examples of the K-2 performance assessment tasks are: 1) first-grade students reading to their teacher on a regular basis while the teacher noted the title of the book and the proficiency of the student's reading; and 2) first-grade students writing about the story the teacher had just read to them and the teachers collecting students' writing samples in individual student portfolio folders.

Data Collection

I observed, audio taped, and took field notes in the four classrooms once a week (half a day per visit in each classroom) to document what and how assessment information was collected and how and why the assessment results were used by classroom teachers. Data collection began on January 14, 1997 when my research project

was approved by College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee, the district administrators, and the school principal. Data were collected through official documents, classroom observations, audio-taping, and interviews. This process of data collection concluded on June 9, 1998.

Documentary Data

I conducted preliminary content analysis on a major documentary data resource—the Primary Performance Assessment Handbook: K-2. This handbook was published by the district and was distributed to each teacher in the district. The Handbook includes the assessment rationale, outcome standard/rubrics, interview guidelines, checklist forms, and report cards. By studying this handbook, the content and modality of the K-2 performance assessment was revealed. The focus of data collection at this stage was on:

1. The historical perspective of the assessment;
2. The characteristics of the design of the assessment;
3. The connection between this assessment and the K-2 curriculum;
4. The content (and linguistic and cultural bias) of guidelines, outcome standards and forms of the assessment; and
5. The intended uses of assessment results.

Chapters in the Handbook include:

Introduction
Self-assessment
Portfolios
Structured Formal Interviews
Record Keeping
Reporting Forms
    Reporting Data to District
    Reporting-to-Parents Forms
Language arts
    K-2 District-Assessed Outcomes: Language 1994/95
    Criteria for K-2 District-Assessed Outcomes: Language 1994/95
    Reading Development Continuum

Writing Development Continuum
Reading Development Continuum End-of-Grade Level Book List
Guidelines for Selecting Literature
Plan for Collecting Evidence of Student Learning
Concepts of Print Checklist: Class Profile
Open-Ended Questions That Promote Responses to Literature
Primary Initial Screening
San Diego State College - Quick Assessment
General Comments
General Articles Relevant to Language Arts

Mathematics

K-2 District Assessment Outcomes: Mathematics 1994/95
Criteria for K-2 District Assessment: Mathematics 1994/95
Assessment Planning Schedule: Mathematics K-2
Summary of Changes in content and Emphasis in K-4 Mathematics
K-2 Mathematics Assessment Script 1994/95
General Comments
General Articles Relevant to Mathematics

Besides the Handbook, I collected: (1) Memoranda sent out by the district research office to teachers regarding any revision of the assessment program, including changes of evaluation criteria and standards, assessment methods, and any administrative changes (e.g., requiring teachers to present report cards to parents in person during parent-teacher conferences); (2) report cards marked and portfolios collected by teachers to examine what information that teachers gathered; (3) copies of K-2 reading textbooks; (4) district-mandated core elementary curriculum on language arts; (5) copies of books or pages that students read in the assessment; and (6) students' writing samples, workbook pages, seatwork, journals, and book reports.

Observation and Audio Taped Data

Once a week, I observed regular classroom routines for half a day in each of the four classes. I went to the same classroom at the same time each week, but switched

classrooms half way through a school year to see different routines in each classroom. Most of the time, the teachers did not mind when I came to their classroom as long as I came to the class at the same time each week. Sometimes teachers did recommend specific times so that I could see some good learning activities. For example, the kindergarten teachers recommended Friday mornings for story dictation, and one first grade teacher recommended Tuesday afternoons for "Reading Buddies" (fifth graders came to read to first graders and listened to first graders read to them). During regular classroom visits, I observed seatwork upon arrival, calendar, reading (e.g., textbook and trade books), writing (journal, book report or summary, letters for purposes), and mathematics classes. Data collection focused on evidence of on-going classroom assessments conducted by the teachers, and teachers' use of information gained from the assessment.

The purpose was to document whether and how teachers conducted performance assessments (e.g., observation, taking notes, collecting writing samples) during regular classroom instructions and the extent to which teachers used the information they gathered. For example, teachers might use the information gained to plan or adjust their grouping, help students read or write during lunch recess, provide books for students to read, and send material home for parents to work with their child. Each classroom visit usually concluded with an informal interview with the teacher regarding their rationale of their lesson plans and decision making.

I also observed and audio taped the assessment procedure conducted by teachers in the four classrooms. Although the K-2 performance assessment program is designed to be an ongoing process, teachers only needed to send report cards to parents three times

a year--November (fall), March (winter), and June (spring). Thus, teachers usually conducted intensive assessments one month before the report cards were due. During these periods of time I usually extended classroom visits to two days in each classroom each week.

Data were collected at the time of assessment to document the content, process and methods of the assessment and to see what information teachers gained from the assessment. I asked teachers to explain the basis they used to evaluate their students, how they marked the report cards and why, what they gained from the assessment, and what they would do with the information gained. The focus was also on how teachers introduced the assessment task, provided prompts/assistance, re-assessed, and gave comments to students. The assessments were audio taped to capture the details of student-teacher interaction, student performance/responses, and, most importantly, what teachers gained from assessing each student.

I collected 116 field note entries; each entry was from observation of one classroom for a half a day. All textual data were saved in Microsoft Word 6.0 (Mac version) and 97 (Window version). The data were later introduced to a qualitative data analysis software, NUD*IST (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing) and were coded.

I also recorded seven 90-minute and nineteen 60-minute audio tapes of interviews, assessment, and some classroom routines. Altogether, there is at least 1170 minutes (19.5 hours) of tape. Since most tapes were recorded at half speed, the actual length of the tapes can be as long as 2340 minutes or 39 hours. All of the assessment portions of the tapes were transcribed.

Interview Data

Informal interviews with classroom teachers were conducted after each classroom observation. This was to seek clarification and the rationale of the teacher's lesson plan, presentation approach, activities, and, most importantly, the extent to which what had been observed in the classroom resulted from the information gained from the K-2 performance assessment program. I asked teachers questions such as "How did you get the idea of teaching this activity/lesson?" "Why did you decide to teach this activity/lesson?" "What's the purpose of teaching this activity/lesson?" "Is this activity/lesson for an assessment purpose? "What do you think of students' response to this activity/lesson?" "What do you think of students' performance?" This type of interview lasted for 5-15 minutes each time.

Informal interviews with teachers were also conducted during and immediately after each assessment in order to obtain information about what teachers gained from the assessment, how teachers justified their evaluation of students' performance, and how they would respond to the assessment results. I asked teachers to think aloud when they made decisions on grading their student performance. Teachers usually showed me a reading/writing rubric a checklist or their notes, and told me, "This is how I (the teacher) marked because . . . (e.g., "S/he (the student) did not use pictures cues" "S/he could not explain how he did it without my prompts") and I'm going to . . . (e.g., "call his mom" or "spend more time with her during lunch recess")."

I conducted semi-structured open-ended interviews with the four classroom teachers regarding the information gained, methods used, and use of results in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assessment program. A list of end-of-project interview questions was presented to each classroom teacher and an hour-long interview was scheduled the following week. These interviews were audio taped. The focus of the end-of-project interview was teacher backgrounds, general impressions about the assessment program, and, most importantly, the information gained, methods used, and use of assessment results. Interview questions were:

1. Background:

   (a) How long have you been teaching; and how long have you taught at this school?
   (b) Describe your educational background.
   (c) What kind of certification do you hold?

2. General impression of the K-2 Performance Assessment Program:

   (a) Would you say that you have learned anything about assessment through this assessment program? What have you learned?
   (b) What is best about the K-2 Performance Assessment Program? Why?
   (c) What is worst about the K-2 Performance Assessment Program? Why?

3. Information gained from the K-2 Performance Assessment Program:

   (a) Would you say that you have learned anything about your students through this assessment program? What have you learned?
   (b) In what way does the assessment program provide information about your students?

4. Assessment methods used in the K-2 Performance Assessment Program:

   (a) How do you fill out your report cards? What are your source(s)?
   (b) When and how often do you collect data for report cards? Why?
   (c) How many methods do you use to collect data for report cards? Which one do you use the most? Why? How about the assessment methods suggested by the district office, for example, observations, structured interviews, portfolios, and self-assessment?

5. Use of assessment results/information gained from the K-2 Performance Assessment Program:

(a) Would you say that the information gained from the assessment helps you teach? How?
(b) What do you do with the assessment results or information you gained from the assessment?
(c) Do you run into any problems when trying to use the assessment results in your classroom?

Professor Georgia García (e-mail dated June 29, 1998) commented that these questions were too leading because they assumed the district assessment was important to teachers. Professor García also recommended individualizing the questions to each teacher based on the key issues observed in each classroom. Professor García suggested the following questions:

1. When you write your report cards, what information do you use?
2. What information do you use when you group students?
3. How do you decide to place students?

I concurred with Profess García's and planned to go back to "Washington" School to interview these four teachers again. A tentative list of questions was:

1. What decisions do you usually need to make when you teach? What information do you use?
2. What decision do you usually need to make when you plan your lessons? What information do you use?
3. What decisions do you usually make when you assess your students? What information do you use?
4. How are you informed of your students' learning needs?
5. How are you informed of your teaching?
6. How do you describe the K-2 performance assessment program? How do you use it?
7. How do you describe your teaching styles and philosophy?

I would ask "Ms. Nixon" (kindergarten teacher), "I saw that you changed your activities in each learning center quite often. How do you decide what to change? What information do you use to make the decisions?" I would ask "Ms. Carter" (first grade

teacher), "I saw that you spend a lot of individual time with your students. What decisions do you have to make to fulfill their learning needs? What information do you use to make the decisions?" I would ask "Ms. Ford" (the other first grade teacher), "I saw that you usually had to teach one to two reading groups each morning. What decisions do you have to make when you teach in reading groups? What information do you use to make the decisions?" I would ask "Ms. Reagan" (second grade teacher), "I saw you audio tape your students when they read to you during the assessment. What have you learned from this audio taping?"

However, my preliminary examination committee later decided that the follow-up interview was not necessary but I should learn from Professor Garcia's suggestion as part of my doctoral training.

Interviews with district administrators were conducted at the beginning of the study to obtain the original design, historical perspective, and political context of the assessment program. Regular personal contacts (for about 30-50 minutes each) were also maintained twice a year with district administrators in order to seek clarification of what had been observed in the classroom as well as to obtain the latest update on the assessment program.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted through a computer software called NUD*IST (version 4.0). This software is designed for the storage, coding, retrieval, and analysis of text. The first stage of data analysis included: 1) developing a list of categories/codes; 2) designing categorical codes to segments of data, with the possibility of attaching multiple

codes to one segment as well as overlapped segments sharing one code; and 3) eliminating less productive codes and expanding the ideas that data reveals.

During the second stage of data analysis, data were read over, and eventually summaries of data for each of the four teachers were developed, according to the key areas of the research questions.

Data Coding

I used grounded theory methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) to code data, for example, labeling phenomena , discovering categories, naming categories, developing categories in terms of their properties and dimensions. Strauss and Corbin suggest that two procedures should be constantly employed: asking questions and making comparisons. Basic questions that one should ask are "Who? When? Where? What? How? How much? and Why?" Techniques of comparisons include: "the flip-flop technique," "systematic comparison of two or more phenomena," and "close-in and far-out procedures."

Specifically, I read through all of my field notes and kept a log of each document. I logged the text numbers (automatically numbered by the software) that corresponded to a time line, events, and participants. The log gave me an overview of the context (e.g., time, participants, reading material, and activities) of a specific chunk of data, as well as helped me locate data quickly (e.g., a specific student's reading assessment results). Meanwhile, I coded the district observation, interview, and documentary data first. Based on the themes that evolved from the data, I coded the data into seven categories: Name, Purpose, Support, Communication, Method/Strategy, Property, Curriculum and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instruction, Rubrics, and Report Card. I used this categorical system to code my classroom observation and audio data of the four teachers. Besides the seven codes, each teacher had some codes there were not shared by others because of their unique features of teaching style and classroom context. The coding system that I developed via NUD*IST are:

Table 1

Coding System

	Levels of codes			
Code numbers	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
(1)	District			
(1 1)		Name		
(1 2)		Purpose		
(1 3)		Support		
(1 5)		Communication		
(1 6)		Method or strategy		
(1 7)		Property		
(1 8)		Curriculum and instruction		
(1 9)		Rubrics		
(1 10)		Report card		
(2)	Carter			
(2 1)		Integration		
(2 2)		Sources		
(2 3)		Methods		
(2 3 1)			Observation	
(2 3 2)			Interview	
(2 3 3)			Portfolio	
(2 3 4)			Self assessment	
(2 4)		Rubrics		
(2 5)		Communication		
(2 6)		Records		
(2 7)		Use of information		
(2 8)		Non K2 assessment		
(2 8 1)			Reading and writing	
(2 8 2)			Individual teaching	

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Code numbers	Levels of codes			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
(2 8 3)			Assessment	
(2 8 5)			Reading group	
(2 9)		Profile		
(3)	Ford			
(3 1)		Integration		
(3 2)		Sources		
(3 3)		Non K2 assessment		
(3 3 1)			Reading and Writing	
(3 3 2)			Individual Teaching	
(3 3 3)			Assessment	
(3 3 4)			Reading Group	
(3 3 5)			Grading	
(3 4)		Rubrics		
(3 5)		Communication		
(3 6)		Records		
(3 7)		Use of Information		
(3 8)		Profile		
(3 9)		Methods		
(3 9 1)			Observation	
(3 9 2)			Interview	
(3 9 3)			Portfolio	
(3 9 4)			Self assessment	
(4)	NIXON			
(4 1)		Integration		
(4 2)		Sources		
(4 3)		Profile		
(4 4)		Rubrics		
(4 5)		Communication		
(4 6)		Records		
(4 7)		Use of Information		
(4 8)		Methods		
(4 8 1)			Observation	
(4 8 2)			Interview	
(4 8 3)			Portfolio	
(4 8 4)			Self assessment	

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Code numbers	Levels of codes			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
(4 9)		Non K-2 Assessment		
(4 9 1)			Individual Teaching	
(4 9 2)			Reading and Writing	
(4 9 2 6)				Calendar
(4 9 3)			Assessment	
(5)	REAGAN			
(5 1)		Integration		
(5 2)		Sources		
(5 3)		Profile		
(5 4)		Rubrics		
(5 5)		Communication		
(5 6)		Records		
(5 7)		Use of Information		
(5 8)		Methods		
(5 8 1)			Observation	
(5 8 2)			Interview	
(5 8 3)			Portfolio	
(5 8 4)			Self assessment	
(5 9)		Non K-2 Assessment		
(5 9 1)			Individual Teaching	
(5 9 2)			Reading and Writing	
(5 9 2 1)				Book Report
(5 9 2 3)				Groups
(5 9 3)			Assessment	
(5 9 4)			Work Checking	

Memos

I read through the data of each code and sorted out themes. Usually several themes evolved in each code. I gave every theme a title so that I could have an overview of all themes developed in each code. I used the 'axial coding' technique (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) to join data that were of the same theme, to examine the relationship among themes, and to write my observation and interpretation of each theme. Sometimes

themes were related by time, and sometimes themes were different aspects or characteristics of a phenomenon. I organized and numbered themes into a somewhat hierarchical system. If a theme was not related to others of the same code, I just wrote a memo about the data and left it there.

I then re-organized my themes and memos of each code and added transitions so that the whole presentation of each code made sense to myself and readers. I cited data whenever I made assertions so that my interpretation and reasoning paths were transparent to readers (and participants for member checking). I re-examined the original document to ensure that the context was taken into consideration, the transition was correct, and the assertions that I made were not biased by my own belief. This technique, i.e., rechecking assertions against raw data to ensure that a "story" is told appropriately, is strongly recommended by Strauss and Corbin.

Building Trustworthiness

Within the conventional paradigm, the term, "reliability" means "the extent to which an experiment, test, or measuring procedure yields the same result in repeated trials" ("Webster's Third New International Dictionary," 1986). Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that replicability can only exist in a constructed framework and, in reality, no one can "cross the *same* stream twice." They propose that "dependability" should be substituted for "reliability" in naturalistic inquiry. Lincoln and Guba argue that, while "instrument decay" is treated as error or unreliability in traditional theory, naturalists take into account "instability and phenomenal or design induced change." They treat these factors as part of the entity being studied.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In terms of techniques of establishing the "dependendability" of a naturalistic study, one of the authors suggested that demonstration of "credibility" is equivalent to demonstration of "dependability"--if one can demonstrate that a study has the quality of credibility (or "internal validity", conventionally) then one does not have to demonstrate dependability separately.

Lincoln and Guba propose a stronger test to establish "dependability." They believe that an auditor should examine the process of the inquiry. The auditor should examine the "appropriateness of inquiry decisions and methodological shifts." For example, whether the inquirer's bias, premature judgments, or practical matters (e.g., arbitrary deadlines) influence the sampling decisions and triangulation processes.

Lincoln and Guba further argue that the auditor's examination of the product of the inquiry--"the data, findings, interpretations, and recommendations" can establish the "confirmability" (or "objectivity", conventionally) of the inquiry. They believe that the auditor should trace a sampling of findings back to the raw data to examine the appropriateness of category labels, category structures, accommodation of negative examples, interpretation, and inferences.

Putting "dependentability" into Lincoln and Guba's naturalistic paradigm, the notion of the "trustworthiness" of naturalistic inquiry is illustrated as follows. First, a trustworthy study obtains credible findings through prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, and member checks ("credibility" or "internal validity"). Second, the study provides thick description of time and context so that someone who is interested in the study can make transferability judgments ("transferability" or "external validity"). Third, the inquiry makes dependable

sampling decisions ("dependability" or "reliability") and the inquirer's bias is reviewed. Fourth, the findings of the study are confirmed with data ("confirmability" or "objectivity") with a clear audit trail (raw data, analysis notes, and instruments) and processes (negotiation between an auditor and auditee).

Strategies used to address trustworthiness of this research project are an audit trail, prolonged engagement, multiple data sources/methods triangulation, debriefings to project supervisors, and member checking.

Audit Trail

In this study, I explained how the site and participants were selected. I provided information about the social context from which data were collected. I explained how data were collected, how categories were developed, and how findings were derived from the data throughout my inquiry.

Furthermore, all texts (including transcriptions of audio tapes) in this study are automatically numbered by NUD*IST. These text numbers of data source will always be cited when conducting data analysis. This will provide quick access to anyone who is interested in tracing from my interpretation or findings to raw data.

Prolonged Engagement

I engaged in the field approximately once a week for half a day each time in each classroom for 18 months. I became familiar with the program, culture, students, teachers, district administrators, the overall atmosphere of classrooms, school, and district. I also

gained trust from the participants and asked participants for clarifications and explanations regarding my observations.

Multiple Data Sources/Methods Triangulation

I examined multiple data sources to examine whether what was observed and reported carried the same meaning under different circumstances (e.g., time, space, relationship). If there was any variation, I would explore the basis of the difference. For example, after a talk with a teacher about the teacher's trust of the assessment program, I observed how the teacher pursued the assessment procedures when assessing the students, and how she reported the assessment results to parents. This cross-event investigation helped me better understand the perspectives of the subjects and to accurately represent issues.

Methodological triangulation was also employed when collecting data. For example, after I observed some assessment procedures, I interviewed the teacher and asked what procedures were used and why particular procedures were chosen.

Data from multiple sources were also explored when conducting data analysis. For example, in order to understand what information teachers collected from the assessment, I analyzed the interview data with teachers, the observation data from regular classroom teaching and during the assessment, and the documentary data from the district assessment Handbook.

Debriefings to Project Supervisors

I communicated with my dissertation committee members: Dr. Fred Davidson, Dr. Lizanne DeStefano, Dr. Georgia García, and Dr. Liora Bresler through face-to-face conferencing, phone, and e-mail. These contacts are to discuss my data analysis, interpretation, and findings. I presented some preliminary data analysis using multiple data sources to my committee members in my preliminary examination.

Member Checking

A District administrator ("Ms. Johnson") was ask to review a draft of Chapter Four and the four teachers were asked to review Chapter Five where their own actions and/or words were featured. They were asked to review the material for accuracy and palatability and were encouraged "to provide alternative language or interpretation but [were] not promised that that version will appear in the final report" (Stake, 1995, p. 115). A cover letter was attached to each draft to indicate the reviewer's own pseudonym and a list of students' actual names and pseudonyms was also provided to teachers. A copy of cover letters is in Appendix H.

Ms. Nixon gave a very brief written comment—"Looks really good! Hope all goes well!" Ms. Reagan reviewed the draft and met with me to talk about her comments. Ms. Johnson, Ms. Carter, and Ms. Ford wrote their comments on the draft and met with me individually. All written and oral comments were cited as dated "personal communication" in Chapter Four and Five.

Specifically, Ms. Reagan agreed that the draft reflected what happened in her classroom but indicated that her critics on the assessment program looked very strong.

Yet, Ms. Reagan did not want to change the wording because it revealed her true feeling. Johnson indicated that the issues that I pointed out regarding the assessment design and district expectations were appropriate. Johnson gave further information about the technical support that the District provided to teachers. Ms. Ford gave alternative wording on direct quotes. More importantly, Ms. Ford also gave further explanation about her assessment practices; for example, integration of assessments into teaching, timing and content of work sample selections, lack of communication with colleagues, and grading approach and standard. Ms. Carter was particularly concerned that the meaning of some direct quoted was not clear and requested for re-wording. Ms. Carter also gave further explanations about her remedial teaching (during interview assessments) and her book selection for reading assessments.

CHAPTER 4

THE K-2 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL: DESIGN AND EXPECTATIONS

Introduction

This chapter documents and analyzes how the K-2 Performance Assessment Program was designed and maintained at the District Research Office. The data sources are interviews with a District administrator, official documents, and workshop observations. The aim is to understand and document the design and expectations of the assessment program at the district level so that further analysis on assessment practices, information gained, and use of assessment results at the classroom level can be conducted (see Chapter Five "The K-2 Performance Assessment Program at the Classroom Level: Four Case Studies of Teacher Practices"). There is a discussion at the end of this chapter to illustrate how the present assessment program is theory-grounded.

Design

Name(s)

There are several slightly different names for the K-2 performance assessment program[1]. Originally, the District designed the assessment as a *performance assessment* for grades K-2 and defined the assessment in a handbook as follows:

---

[1] The original assessment program included language arts and mathematics. The scope of the present study only limited to the assessment on language arts.

> Assessment that requires a student to create an answer or a product that demonstrates his/her knowledge or skills. Students are responsible for creating or constructing their responses. The process is at least as important as the product" (p. 10).

However, the name shown on the K-2 performance assessment handbook is "Primary Assessment Handbook: K-2." The name on the cover page of the handbook is "Primary Performance Assessment Handbook K-2." In the "Introduction" chapter, the handbook states that "*the performance assessment program* has not been finished because curriculum development and instructional designs are never finished". When talking about the needs and underlying assumptions of the assessment (in the chapter of "The Big Picture"), the handbook refers to the assessment as *The "Adams" Public Schools Performance Assessment Program* and *K-2 Performance Assessment.* Nonetheless, District/school administrators and teachers often refer to this assessment simply as the *K-2 Assessment*[2].

In formal documents such as the assessment Handbook, the term 'performance' was usually used. In normal conversation, the term 'performance' was never mentioned by teachers or the principal, only sometimes by the administrators at the District Research Office. There did not seem to be a definite reason that teachers dropped the term "performance" when they referred to the assessment program. Nothing I observed indicates that, although teachers dropped the term "performance" when referring to the K-2 performance assessment program, teachers did not value the process-oriented aspect of the assessment program.

---

[2] In fact, when the first time I referred to this assessment as "Adams *Performance* Assessment," the school principal and teachers did not quite understand me. They replied, "Oh, you mean K-2 Assessment."

Context

District's Vision of K-2 Curriculum

According to the Handbook, the K-2 curriculum is defined by District mandatory learning outcomes (see Appendix A). Those outcomes are rich in variety to meet the needs of all students and are "equitably accessible to all students". The District emphasizes collaborative hands-on experience in authentic contexts over product-oriented or isolated skill drilling.

District's Vision of K-2 Instruction

The District requires that instruction be aligned with district learning outcomes. At the same time, based on the information obtained from on-going assessments, instruction should also be flexible to meet "each student's cognitive and affective and learning styles". Instruction should emphasize "higher level thinking skills," and provide a variety of learning experiences to students through a variety of group settings. In summary, the goal of instruction is to educate students to become "life-long independent learners" who set goals, make choices, and evaluate performances, and to help teachers become "reflective practitioners" who constantly apply knowledge and insights to teaching situations.

District's Vision of K-2 Assessment

The District's three fundamental beliefs about K-2 assessments are: (1) Teachers are the best assessors of their students and teachers would gain the most from the assessment; (2) students should be familiar with the assessment criteria and become self-

motivated learners; and (3) data obtained from the assessment are to help teachers "identify what students know and understand and where understanding breaks down . . . to align the curriculum and instructions with students' needs" (Adams Public Schools, 1995/6, p. 1).

The District believes that the assessment should align with district outcomes and be an integral part of curriculum and instruction (e.g., embedded in activities). The assessment should represent teachers' best judgment of student progress and be a tool for teachers to monitor student growth toward targets through multiple sources of assessments. The assessment criteria should be clearly defined so that students can monitor their own progress. The District expects the K-2 performance assessment program to provide: (1) formative data about student prior knowledge/understanding and ongoing learning; and (2) summary data regarding student attainment of knowledge and skills.

Needs for the K-2 Performance Assessment

The K-2 Performance Assessment Program was introduced after some massive changes in district outcomes, curriculum, and instructional standards in language arts and mathematics. According to the Handbook, the need for this new format of assessment program was twofold. First, the first-grade "California Achievement Test" (CAT) needed to be replaced. In 1988, first-grade teachers petitioned that CAT was not appropriate for first-grade students and was not useful in obtaining information that teachers needed. The District then worked with teachers to look for an assessment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

system in which the District could monitor student achievements, and the teachers could obtain information of student learning.

Second, the achievement gap between African-American students and other sub-groups needed to be closed. District data in 1984 showed that African-American students achieved far less than other sub-groups. The District committed itself to close this "dramatic discrepancy" by the year 2000. In order to plan appropriate instructional interventions "to prevent or close the gap" in early elementary schooling, the District needed an assessment system that had clear learning targets, criteria, and assessment information.

Fundamentally, it was believed that the assessment program could provide information regarding student learning needs and that this information was useful for teachers. Thus, the new assessment program was developed to *obtain* and *use* information about students. Information about student learning was needed so that the District and teachers could monitor student achievement (against district standards) and provide appropriate instruction, and immediate interventions if necessary.

Content

Outcomes and Criteria

Assessment outcomes (see Appendix B) on reading and writing were selected by a group of K-2 teachers and the District Language Arts Consultant. These outcomes reflected the major attainment targets defined in the district curriculum and student outcomes. The outcomes measured by the district K-2 performance assessments are

learning that ALL students were expected to master ("routinely at an independent level") at the end of the year.

For example, at the end of kindergarten, the student should have the following language skills:

Reading

Comprehension:

5. Demonstrates knowledge of books and print
6. Demonstrates knowledge of

   a. Story structure.
   b. Informational text structure

Word Identification:

7. Recognizes most letters of the alphabet
8. Identifies words/logos within the classroom and outside of school

Attitude:

9. Exhibits positive reading behaviors.

Writing

Process:

Drafting

10. Writes independently to convey meaning

Optional: Uses a computer.
Optional: Uses a computer for writing

Product:

Conventions

11. Uses, independently, some knowledge of letter sounds when writing
12. Writes first name and last name by memory

Speaking

13. Uses oral language to communicate.

For each assessment outcome, evaluation criteria and examples were then specified (see Appendix C). For example, the corresponding criteria for achieving Kindergarten Language Outcome 9 ("Exhibits positive reading behaviors") was as follows:

> Demonstrates all of the following:
>
> Over time, is routinely actively involved with books during "almost-silent" reading time.
> Attends to reading activities by:
>
> . Listening to stories,
> . Joining in during the reading of familiar stories,
> . Discussing stories,
> . Responding to stories.
>
> Such as:
>
> Memorizes pattern books and familiar books.
> Responds to stories by:
>
> . Asking to have a text re-read,
> . Drawing pictures of favorite parts of a book,
> . Using the text structure as a model for writing,
> . Relating stories to personal experiences.

Besides the criteria for the target outcome ("Achieving") as listed above, the District also specified features of *under*-achievement ("Not yet" and "Developing") and *over*-achievement ("Extending"). The characteristics of "Not yet," "Developing," and "Extending" for the Kindergarten Language Outcome 9 ("Exhibits positive reading behaviors") are as follows:

Table 2

Criteria for Kindergarten District-Assessed Outcomes Language Arts

Not yet	Developing	Achieving	Extending
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Demonstrates little confidence in own ability to interact with printed material. Shows little interest in books. Does not attend to reading activities	Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Occasionally shows interest in reading. Takes a book if asked to, but shows limited interest. Attends to reading activities with teacher direction and support.	Demonstrates all of the following: Over time, is routinely actively involved with books during "almost-silent" reading time. Attends to reading activities by: . listening to stories, . joining in during the reading of familiar stories, . discussing stories, . responding to stories. Such as: Memorizes pattern books and familiar books. Responds to stories by: . asking to have a text re-read, . drawing pictures of favorite parts of a book, . using the text structure as a model for writing, . relating stories to personal experiences.	Reads the text in books conventionally.

Since every class usually had students whose skills spanned several grade levels, the District developed a rubric/continuum (see Appendix D) of reading and writing skills across grade levels. There were five levels: "Pre-emergent (developing kindergarten),"

"Emergent (kindergarten)," "Developing (developing first grade)," Beginning (first grade)" and "Expanding (second grade)." The set of kindergarten "Pre-emergent," "Emergent," and "Developing" reading skill rubric was specified as follows:

Table 3

Reading Development Continuum

Proficiency Level	Categories	Attainments
PRE-EMERGENT *(Developing K)*	COMPREHENSION	Holds books, correctly turns pages (K.5[3]). Shows start/end of book (K.5). Distinguishes between a letter, a word, and a numeral (K.5)
	WORD IDENTIFICATION	Knows some letter names Has sufficient vocabulary to discuss everyday experiences, events, and objects (K. 13).
	ATTITUDE	Pretends to read. Listens and responds to literature (K.9). Shows interest in environmental print. Chooses books and has favorites.
EMERGENT *(Target for end of K year)*	COMPREHENSION	Demonstrates left-to-right directional movement (K.5) Uses props to tell a story (original or retelling) with characters and major events (K.6a). Identifies topic and supporting details of an informational text read to them (K.6b) (1.3)

(table continues)

[3] Indicates the district outcome for which a scoring rubric has been developed.

Table 3 (continued)

Proficiency Level	Categories	Attainments
	WORD IDENTIFICATION	Rhymes and plays with words. Recognizes names and high-frequency words (K.8). Knows some letter sounds in reading or writing contexts. Identifies most letters of the alphabet (K.7).
	ATTITUDE	Participates in reading of familiar books (K.9). Memorizes pattern books and familiar books. Gives and supports personal responses to stories read to them (K.9). Maintains interest in chosen books for a short amount of time (e.g., 10 minutes) (K.9).
DEVELOPING *(Developing first grade targets)*		
	COMPREHENSION	Makes predictions based on pictures and title. Relies on print and illustrations to construct meaning (1.7).
	WORD IDENTIFICATION	Reads books with word patterns. Tracks words: has one-to-one correspondence. Begins to build a sight-word vocabulary to draw upon, with automaticity, when reading. Identifies upper and lower case letters (1.5). Knows most letter sounds in reading and writing contexts.
	ATTITUDE	Sees self as a reader. Independently chooses books s/he likes to read and/or look at (1.1).

The cross-grade continuum/rubric in reading and writing helped teachers identify students' specific and overall reading and writing skills, especially when the student's

performance was below or beyond the grade level. The teachers were required to date and mark on the continuum/rubric and turn it to the District Research Office.

A simplified version of the continuum/rubric on reading, writing, and speaking/spelling became the report cards. The report cards (see Appendix E) were sent to parents.

Reporting Forms

Teachers were required to conduct and report the assessment results to the District twice (Fall- November, and Spring- June) and parents (Fall- November, Winter- March, and Spring- June) three times a year. Teachers were given release time for record keeping and reporting.

Audiences of district reporting forms were teachers, parents, and the District. The reporting form for the District specified each student's reading and writing proficiency on a rubric or continuum. The report form sent to parents was a simplified version of the reading and writing rubric/continuum.

The report card included all aspects of student learning in school, including reading and writing. Teachers needed to mark "S" (satisfactory), "P" (making progress), or "I" (Needs to Improve) on the items included under "Learning and Social Behaviors," "Social Studies" and "Art, Music, and Physical Education." Teachers had to decide whether a student's mathematics ability was at "BE" (Beginning), high/mid/low "DEV" (Developing), or "SE" (Secure) on about ten mathematics skill items. Teachers also needed to check whether a student "explored" the listed scientific activities. Finally,

teachers had to check student reading and writing skills on respective rubrics as well as mark reading, writing, and speaking/spelling proficiency on report cards.

Expectations

Ms. Johnson, at the District Research Office, was responsible for developing and maintaining the K-2 Performance Assessment Program. Based on the observational and interview data obtained from Ms. Johnson, and the documentary data collected from the Handbook, the District's expected practices and functions of the assessment program were as discussed below.

In a workshop to help the ESL teachers to conceptualize the K-2 Performance Assessment Program, Ms. Johnson emphasized that teachers were expected to implement the assessment program on three aspects. First, on the aspect of assessment practices, teachers were expected to integrate the assessment into their day-to-day teaching, collect "a variety of evidence of learning" of students across contexts over time, use a variety of assessment methods and to involve students in the assessment processes, and support/communicate with one another. Second, on the aspect of the information obtained from the assessments, teachers were expected to identify all levels of developing processes specified in the rubrics and document the assessment results. Third, on the aspect of using the assessment results, teachers were expected to provide immediate and appropriate intervention.

Assessment Practices

The District encouraged teachers to use multiple sources to assess students' performance based on "routine behaviors over time, not just on a single interview or worksheet . . . 'solid knowledge' that has be demonstrated over time in a variety of contexts." Ms. Johnson strongly objected to teachers treating the assessment as a three-times-a-year event and viewing the information collected as just data to report to the District Research Office (data source: District 1703-1703). In an interview, Ms. Johnson noted that the assessment took time but insisted that, in order to obtain useful information of each student's learning needs and process, the K-2 performance assessment needed to be flexibly used in and outside the classroom throughout the year (data source: Meetings 107-111).

Ms. Johnson encouraged teachers to collect assessment data from multiple sources across contexts. For example, teachers should observe student behavior over time when students were engaged in reading/writing tasks individually or in a group. Teachers should also ask students probing questions, examine writing samples, and consider student self-evaluation (data source: Meetings 78-82). Ms. Johnson cautioned teachers that "if the behavior was observed only one time, it was not enough" (data source: Meetings 174).

Ms. Johnson stressed "the use of a variety of assessment methods" e.g., observation, structured interview, portfolio, and self-assessment (personal communication, December 3, 1999). The District encouraged teachers to observe student performance during everyday instruction and when students were involved in activities. The District recommended that teachers should: (1) give students "multiple opportunities

in everyday classroom activities" to demonstrate their understanding and skills; (2) have a thorough knowledge of the assessment criteria to recognize target behaviors; and (3) maintain a personal record system to document what they saw. In a personal communication with Ms. Johnson (December 3, 1999), she commented on the technical support (on conducting observation) that the District provided to teachers. Ms. Johnson said:

> During the first four year of the program, the District provided teachers with a great deal of guidance and training in conducting classroom observations and collecting/documenting observational data in the classroom. In the subsequent years, training was limited to new teachers.

The original design of "structured formal individual interviews" was for teachers: (1) to develop/fine-tune common understandings of assessment criteria, (2) to explore the depth and dimensions of a student's learning, and (3) to evaluate or validate teachers' informal assessments. The District recommended structured interviews when a student was "new," "shy," and/or with "uneven performance." The District also recommended on-the-spot remedial teaching, "when the student's performance indicates such a need" (p. 13).

However, the District believed that isolated one-on-one structured interviews should be treated as "training wheels on a bike" for teachers. The District's ultimate goal was for teachers to assess student performance through multiple sources during regular classroom instruction and activities, which the Handbook specified as follows:

> As we [teachers] become more skilled in recognizing the criteria when we see it in classroom settings, more skilled at asking probing questions in the context of instruction, and more skilled at keeping anecdotal records, our need to conduct isolated interviews for all data collection will decline (p. 12).

The District recognized some disadvantages when formal interviews were used "almost exclusively" or became the norm of assessment. The disadvantages could be: (1) Assessments were unrelated to curriculum planning and classroom instruction; (2) teachers did not have time to complete the assessment; and (3) high anxiety was felt by teachers and students.

In the workshop, one group of ESL teachers reported and Ms. Johnson agreed that teachers should use one-on-one interview assessments to examine student thinking processes and their level of understanding through asking probing questions. Nonetheless, Ms. Johnson emphasized that teachers should continue to observe students in classroom contexts (data source: Meetings 148-154).

Teachers were encouraged to keep "writing samples, reading logs, and/or math journal pages" in a folder or portfolio for each student. According to the Handbook, portfolios were to document student learning outcomes, difficulty, efforts, and growth over time. Portfolios could also be used to involve students in ongoing self-assessment and to communicate with parents.

Ms. Johnson encouraged teachers to use portfolio assessment, because most teachers already kept a folder for each student's work. Teachers just needed to "think of the folders as portfolios" (personal conversation December 3, 1999). Ms. Johnson suggested that teachers should start the portfolio assessment on a small scale and should share information with and support one another. The portfolio assessment should also fit into classroom routines. Ms. Johnson recommended that portfolio assessments should involve students. When students selected their own work for the portfolio, teachers should find out why students chose particular work in their portfolio. When teachers

were the ones who selected the work for the portfolio, they should inform students why a particular piece of work was or was not chosen. Ms. Johnson suggested that the portfolio could be a diagnostic tool for teachers to find out student learning gaps when teachers reviewed student work in their portfolios. Ms. Johnson believed that, eventually, portfolios should be shared with parents and other teachers (data source: Meetings 132-146).

It should be noted that although the term "portfolio" was used in the handbook as an assessment method, Ms. Johnson, preferred "work samples" to be used in this study (personal communication, December 3, 1999). Ms. Johnson believes that "portfolio assessment" is a specific form of alternative assessment and requires a series of special procedures. Ms Johnson said that she usually provided technical assistance to schools or teachers who request the use of "portfolio assessment." Ms. Johnson did not recall the school that I studied requested such assistance. In the present study, 'portfolio/work samples' and 'folder/portfolio' are used to reflect perspectives of the assessment handbook and the District administrator perspectives on this regard.

According to the Handbook, the K-2 performance assessment emphasized the importance of student self-assessment. The rationale for self-assessment was to empower students to take responsibility for and ownership of their own learning, and to provide teachers with information about students' thinking and understanding. For example, teachers could ask students to think aloud when reflecting upon strategies to identify unknown words. I noticed that the District recommended some self-assessment literature on reading and writing in the Handbook.

Ms. Johnson believed that self-assessments could help students activate their desire to learn (data source: Meeting: 130) and emphasized that student self-assessment "really works" because students needed to know "if they hit the target or not" (data source: Meetings 85). Ms. Johnson asked ESL teachers in the workshop how they would use student self-assessment on young children (K-2). Some teachers suggested (and Ms. Johnson agreed) that they could ask students to color the letters that they recognized and to use smiling or crying faces to indicate if they liked to read (data source: Meetings 86-91).

In a personal communication with Ms. Johnson (December 3, 1999), she commented on the District provision of technical support to teachers. Ms. Johnson said: "The District provided some ideas on self-assessments in the overall training provided to teachers. The District recommended some resources on self-assessments and provided further assistance to those teachers and schools who requested it."

Ms. Johnson expected a great deal of communication among teachers. Ms. Johnson recommended teachers ask their colleagues to re-assess a student if they felt that a second opinion was needed to help them make decisions. For example, one teacher could ask his/her colleague. Would you assess this kid and then let's talk?" (data source: Meetings: 114-117).

Ms. Johnson also hoped to see teachers talking about the assessment information that they passed on or received. For example, when one teacher had a question about the information s/he received, s/he should contact the teacher who assessed the student to find out the context of the assessment. Ms. Johnson suggested that teachers should take into account the fact that what students learn in May might not be secure enough to show

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

up in September. Ms. Johnson said that most second grade teachers thought that first grade teachers marked student performance too high (data source: District 1707).

Ms. Johnson also suggested that teachers write down their thoughts about the assessment. This was for the teachers to build a network with the District to improve the assessment program (data source: Meetings 127).

Information Gained

Ms. Johnson emphasized that the K-2 Performance Assessment Program focused on learning processes and was criteria-oriented, because students' performance was constantly documented and compared against evaluative rubrics (data source: Meetings 56–57). Ms. Johnson believed that, since the reading and writing rubrics were laid out as continua, a wide range of proficiency levels would be captured (data source: Meetings 63-65). Ms. Johnson recommended that teachers be familiar with the rubrics/criteria so that when they saw the behavior in a student they knew the student hit a specific target (data source: Meetings 173).

Ms. Johnson commented that the performance assessment was developed as an alternative form of assessments to replace standardized assessments and that the intent of performance assessment was to look for "a variety of evidence of learning" (data source: Meetings 127). Ms. Johnson recommended that teachers take notes of their observations on a daily basis. Teachers could develop their own working system (e.g., checklists) to organize their observation and records. Teachers were also encouraged to reflect upon and record their observations. All K-2 teachers were required to mark on the reading and

writing rubrics (see Appendix D) and "*share* the information with" the District Research Office (personal communication with Ms. Johnson, December 3, 1999).

Use of Assessment Results

There were five major uses for the information obtained from the assessment: (1) to use the information for making daily decisions; (2) to find out the overall growth of the students; (3) to inform other teachers; (4) to report to the parents; and (5) to report to the District to kept track of all student development (data source: Meetings 157-163).

Ms. Johnson believed that the fundamental use of the information obtained from the K-2 Performance Assessment Program was for classroom teachers to provide immediate and appropriate individualized instruction when the student's developing process, proficiency level, and learning needs were captured by the evaluative rubrics (Data source: Meetings 63-65).

The information obtained from the assessment would also help facilitate "good conversation" (e.g., "Would you assess this kid and then lets' talk?") among teachers. This was especially important when teachers tried to diagnose a specific student's learning problem(s) which could be "something to do with material, maybe the intervention style" (data source: Meetings 114-122).

To summarize, the District expected teachers to integrate the assessment into their day-to-day instruction and to collect data from multiple sources. The District also expected teachers to use a variety of assessment methods to collect data and to communicate with one another about the information they obtained. The District expected teachers to compare what they obtained against evaluative rubrics, and keep

records. Most importantly, the District expected teachers to use the information to provide individualized quality teaching.

In the next chapter, teacher assessment practices are examined to understand the extent to which teachers implemented the assessment program as the District and/or theories expected, the extent to which literacy skills were identified, and the extent to which teachers used the assessment results to adjust their instruction. For example, how teachers were empowered when they implemented the assessment program (Smith & Cohen, 1992), how they observed and made professional judgment (Mehrens, 1992) when they gathered information, and how teachers became more sensible and responsive to diverse learning style (Falk, 1994) when they applied the assessment results to their teaching.

CHAPTER 5

THE K-2 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM AT THE CLASSROOM LEVEL: FOUR CASE STUDIES OF TEACHER PRACTICES

Introduction

This chapter documents and analyzes how the K-2 Performance Assessment Program was implemented by the four teachers in their classroom. This chapter is organized into four teacher case studies. The purpose is to examine detailed contextual information to understand the implementation of the assessment program at the classroom level in order to answer my research questions. First, how did teachers implement the assessment program? Second, what information was gained and how? Third, how did teachers use the information gained? The three research questions provide three focuses for the discussion of each teacher. That is, their assessment practices (on the aspects of integration, data sources, assessment methods, and communication), the information they gained from rubrics (on the aspects of rubric use and record/documentation), and their use of assessment results. Findings regarding each focus are compared with literature on performance assessments (reviewed in Chapter One and Two) to illustrate the significance of the findings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ms. Nixon

Profile

Ms. Nixon is a kindergarten teacher. Ms. Nixon holds a bachelor's degree in elementary education with an emphasis on reading. Ms. Nixon has two teaching certificates. One is from the State of "L" and one from the State of "M"; both are K-8. Ms. Nixon mentioned that in the State of "L," four additional classes are needed to teach kindergarten" (data source: 98Nixon 4834-4837).

By 1997, Ms. Nixon had been teaching for four years. Ms. Nixon came to "Washington" School three years ago and worked as a reading specialist. Ms. Nixon started teaching kindergarten in 1996-97 school year. This was Ms. Nixon's second year as a kindergarten teacher (data source: 98Nixon 4831-4833).

In conversation, Ms. Nixon mentioned that she is a goal-oriented person and she likes to have a great deal of freedom to reach goals (data source: 97Nixon 1080). Ms. Nixon felt that the K-2 Performance Assessment Program matched her personality (data source: 97Nixon 1082) because only goals were laid out, not specific assessment methods and procedures— "This part is wide open" (data source: 97Nixon 1078-1079).

Ms. Nixon felt that she was given a lot of freedom to teach and she liked that. Ms. Nixon believed that there were so many ways to teach and so many ways to learn and, since the teacher knows students the best, she should make the final decision on what would work for students (data source: 97Nixon 2496).

Assessment Practices

Integration

Ms. Nixon repeatedly conducted assessments in her kindergarten classroom to evaluate student ability on recognizing letter names, making letter sounds, and writing one's own first and last names. Ms. Nixon interviewed individual students on September 4 (1997), asked a parent helper to conduct the interviews again on October 27 (1997), and finally evaluated student improvement through large group activities on November 4 and 18 (1997). Recognizing alphabets, making sounds, and writing one's own first and last names were major learning and assessment outcomes in kindergarten (see data source: 97Nixon 216-246).

Ms. Nixon did not seem to develop classroom assessments so that her students could be more 'prepared' for the district assessment. In fact, Ms. Nixon said that she conducted an assessment at the beginning of the year for her own personal use. Ms. Nixon wanted to know her students' ability in recognizing capital and small case letters and writing first and last names (conversation data source: 97Nixon 665-668; assessment data source: 97Nixon 205-312). For example, on October 6, 1997, after teaching four consonants and four vowels, Ms. Nixon stated that she would conduct another round of alphabet recognition assessment in the following week with a different alphabet sheet but the same content--"I don't want to do the same thing twice." Ms. Nixon said that in that assessment, she would especially pay attention to the eight letters (capital, lower case, and sound) she had taught so far—"I want to know if they know what I taught." Ms. Nixon said the purpose of her assessments was to know how she was doing—"A personal check-up for myself" (data source: 97Nixon 1061-1067).

To summarize, Ms. Nixon evaluated her own teaching effectiveness and student attainment on district assessment outcomes (e.g., letter name, sounds, and first/last name) through integrating routine data collection practices into her teaching. The assessment tasks (recognizing letters/sounds and writing one's own name) and assessment methods (interview and observation) seemed to blend into her classroom activities effectively as the District expected.

Data Sources

Ms. Nixon counted on student free-choice journal writing and story dictation ("Creative Writing") to assess writing (data source: 98Nixon 3368). Ms. Nixon also observed student behavior to evaluate the extent to which individual students could accomplish the task independently. Specifically, on March 11, 1998, Ms. Nixon told me that she checked student sentence completion, capitals, letter sounds, and space between words for the March report card (data source: 98Nixon 2118-2124). On October 6, 1997, Ms. Nixon told me about "Creative Writing" on every Friday. Ms. Nixon said that in October, she would give four pictures for students to choose from to dictate a story. Ms. Nixon said that in November the choices would be limited to two, and in December the students would have only one picture (data source: 97K 1047-1051). Starting from January 1998, according to Ms. Nixon, students would have to choose their own topic. Thus, throughout the year, Ms. Nixon developed and followed her aggressive teaching plans on writing. Ms. Nixon gradually increased the intensity of learning activities to reach her personal goals, which were often beyond the district standards.

When assessing reading, Ms. Nixon counted on data sources from observation and interviews. Ms. Nixon called up and observed students in class to check their ability

to recognize letter names and sound out letters. Ms. Nixon also pulled out students and listened to them read individually.

In summary, Ms. Nixon counted on student writing samples and her observation of student writing processes to assess student writing. Ms. Nixon observed student day-to-day reading in class and in pullout interviews.

Assessment Methods

Ms. Nixon used a variety of assessment methods. When reviewing all the methods used, Ms. Ms. Nixon said:

> (Data source: 98Nixon 4956-4958)
> "I used a variety. I used the journal and creative story for writing. I do small groups and large groups. I just keep notes to myself and then again pull out the report card and write what I see, just on top of things. I don't write anything overwhelming. I keep writing samples in their portfolio. I did interviews in the fall [to see] how they feel about their progress."

Ms. Nixon seemed to have developed four strategies to observe her students in class. First, Ms. Nixon focused her observation on a group of students who were sitting at the same table each day. Ms. Nixon checked those students to see if they acquired what Ms. Nixon had taught. For example, Ms. Nixon checked the four consonants and one vowel sounds on October 6, 1997. Ms. Nixon said that she had a very good idea of how the students of the focused group were learning (97Nixon 1058-1060). I remember Ms. Nixon told me that she did not just call up those focused students, but mixed them with other students so that the class would not notice. There were usually three to five students at each table and there were six to seven tables in the classroom (data source: 97Nixon 1055-1056 and 480).

Ms. Nixon's second strategy on observation was to reflect on the questions that students asked. This approach seemed to provide a good source of further observation and investigation. Ms. Nixon recalled that her best reading and mathematics student, Ernest, always asked her where to put the toys back when it was time for cleaning, although the toys were put at the same place every day. Ms. Nixon also noticed that Ernest seldom cleaned up his desk. Ms. Nixon then found out that Ernest was very low on spatial concepts (data source: 97Nixon 3829-3835 and 98Nixon 2016-2019).

Students' NOT asking questions when they wrote also indicated something to Ms. Nixon. Before the March (1998) report card was due, Ms. Nixon told me (March 18, 1998) that in the past two weeks she had been going around the class to see "who could write (i.e., having a topic and ideas), who is writing their own story without any help from the adults". Ms. Nixon said that those who could sit long were the children who could consistently sound out letters (data source: 98Nixon 3028-3031). Ms. Nixon said that students helping each other on sounding out (instead of coming up to Ms. Nixon) also indicated that those students were making progress. Ms. Nixon said, on the other hand, those who came up to ask Ms. Nixon (or other adults) to sound out "every five minutes" were the ones who were not comfortable with their writing (data source: 98Nixon 4908-4917). Ms. Nixon seemed to be pleased that the set-up of the writing activities (journals and Creative Writing) allowed her to observe student learning needs and progress on writing.

Ms. Nixon's third strategy on observation was to make observation work effectively with the interview assessment. Ms. Nixon tended to limit her time on interview/pullout assessments and would conduct interview assessments only when she

could not obtain the data from observations. Ms. Nixon tried to gather as much data from observations as possible because Ms. Nixon felt that she was responsible for the whole class. Ms. Nixon told me that she did not need to pull out students to check if they could hold books and turn pages ("That will be silly to pull kids out"). Ms. Nixon said that she just needed to observe students during Free Choices when there was not pressure on students. On the other hand, Ms. Nixon said that if she wanted to know whether a student could name and sound out letters, she would pull out that students to assess individually (data source: 97Nixon 1069-1075).

Ms. Nixon's fourth strategy on observation was adopting an effective note-taking method to document and organize her data. In fact, Ms. Nixon went through the methods of filing skill checklists (98Nixon 4948) and taking small notes (data source: 98Nixon 3006-3008 and 3027), but eventually she adopted a method recommended by her colleague. Ms. Nixon said that she talked to her teaching consultant partner, Ms. Kennedy, who teaches kindergarten next door. Ms. Kennedy told Ms. Nixon, "You know, let's just do it on the report card. Write all the comments down so parents can see them" (data source: 98Nixon 4948). In the end-of-project interview, Ms. Nixon said that what Ms. Kennedy suggested was a better system than she used to have (i.e., skills checklist and small notes). Ms. Nixon said that she still constantly watched her students but then she would just immediately pull out the report card and write down her observations. For example, Ms: Nixon wrote: "He has mastered (skill name), and he's working on (skill name)" (data source: 98Nixon 4954).

Ms. Nixon also used this "Yeah-It's-All-There" method to document student performance that she observed during pullout interview assessments. Ms. Nixon said she

simply took the report card with her and wrote down everything on the report card. Ms. Nixon said, "That's the easiest way. Then the parents see it. It's all in one place. I don't have a whole bunch of notes everywhere. It just seems to get everything neater and more organized" (data source: 98Nixon 4943).

Ms. Nixon did not particularly emphasize the importance of interview assessments. Ms. Nixon said that, in order to save time and because of her responsibility for the whole class, interview assessments would not be conducted unless the assessment data could not be obtained from other sources, for example, observations. Ms. Nixon trusted her own systematic observations (i.e., one table per day) and data documentation in class (data source: 97Nixon 1058-1060 dated 10/6/97).

Ms. Nixon's attitude toward interview assessments seemed to change in March 1998. Ms. Nixon admitted that she did not like being out of her classroom, and she had tried every possible way to assess in the classroom. Nonetheless, in order to ensure that her students hit the target, Ms. Nixon decided to conduct pullout/interview assessments outside the classroom. Ms. Nixon explained: "You know three days out of my class—my students are going to survive for three days. At first, it really bothered me, but, you know, I have two great student teachers" (data source: 98Nixon 2980-3002).

Ms. Nixon usually requested a substitute teacher when she conducted interview/pullout assessments[1] (data source: 98Nixon 1259-1260), but Ms. Nixon said that the best solution would be for the student teachers to teach the class while the substitute teacher assisted (data source: 98Nixon 1393-1394). Ms. Nixon said that her students were more comfortable with the student teachers than the substitute. Sometime,

[1] Each teacher was given three and half days of release time to conduct the assessments.

Ms. Nixon would just ask the student teachers to teach the class while she assessed (e.g., in 98Nixon 2115-2116). Ms. Nixon said that student maturity (i.e., to be able to stay calm) was also a key for her to conduct interview assessments. Ms. Nixon told me that her sister made an observation when she came for the Halloween program. Ms. Nixon's sister told her that the students Ms. Nixon had this year were calmer and could sit longer than the students that Ms. Nixon had last year. Ms. Nixon agreed with her sister. Ms. Nixon said that she found that she could pull out students for as long as 15 minutes this year, which was impossible in the previous year (data source: 97Nixon 3824-3827).

Ms. Nixon seemed to have developed and followed a strategic assessment agenda, in which cognitive complexity of assessment activities gradually increased to match student literacy development. Specifically, for the November (1997) report card, Ms. Nixon checked basic concepts of books (e.g., opening a book, turning page, and front/back of a book), distinguishing between letter, word, and numeral, high-frequency words (e.g., commercial trademarks and trade names), and the letter and sound that Ms. Nixon had taught. For the March (1998) report card, Ms. Nixon checked letter recognition and sound making two times before the report card was due. In the second round of the assessment, Ms. Nixon also checked student word-level reading ability—Ms. Nixon checked student color word and sight word vocabulary. For advanced readers, Ms. Nixon asked them to read a book. Finally, for the June (1998) report card, Ms. Nixon checked color and sight words again and asked most students to read a book (see data source: 98nixon 3402-3448).

Furthermore, Ms. Nixon appeared to adopt three quality control strategies to ensure the trustworthiness of her interview assessment results. First, Ms. Nixon added

extra procedures to match student reading proficiency level. For example, #3 Outcome of Pre-emergent Comprehension was to assess if a student "Distinguishes between a letter, a word, and a numeral." When Ms. Nixon asked the student to POINT to a letter, a word and a number, she fulfilled the 'requirement' of assessing this assessment outcome. Ms. Nixon's actual procedure of assessing this outcome was beyond the 'requirement.' Ms. Nixon asked some students to SAY the number name, the word, the letter, and the letter sound.

> (Data source: 97Nixon 3537-3557)
> Ms. Nixon told Selina, an average reader: "Now, I'm going to show you three things and I want you to tell me-"
> Ms. Nixon spread out three cards, "stop," "p," and "2," on the table and asked Selina to identify.
> Ms. Nixon: "Point to the letter."
> Selina pointed to 'P.'
> Ms. Nixon: "Good. Point to the word."
> Selina pointed to 'stop.'
> Ms. Nixon: "Point to the number."
> Selina pointed to '2.'
>
> Ms. Nixon: "Do you know what number this is?"
> "2."
> Ms. Nixon: "What letter is this?"
> "P."
> Ms. Nixon: "Right. Do you know what word that is?"
> Selina did not answer.
> Ms. Nixon: "[sa ta O pa]
> Selina: "Stop."
> Ms. Nixon: "Good girl! OK."

Another example of Ms. Nixon's adding an assessment procedure was when Ms. Nixon assessed the students' sight word vocabulary for the # 3 Outcome of Developing Word Identification ("[The student] Begins to build a sight word vocabulary to draw upon, with automaticity, when reading"). I observed Ms. Nixon check her student, Ernest's, proficiency level on sight word vocabulary but did not check another good

reader, Jacqueline (data source: 97Nixon 3902-3984) or average readers, such as Ena (data source: 97Nixon 3365-3459), Selina (data source: 97Nixon 3524-3626), and Peter (data source: 97Nixon 3715-3789) on sight word vocabulary. Ms. Nixon was probably aware that Ernest knew some sight words, so she added an assessment item to check Earnest's proficiency level.

Ms. Nixon's second strategy to ensure trustworthiness of interview assessment results was applying a strict standard to her grading. That is, whenever Ms. Nixon prompted, she graded the student as not passing that assessment item. In the data below, Ms. Nixon put the letter cards that she prompted in a separate pile. These would be the letters that the student did not pass.

(Data source: 97Nixon 3569-3591)
Ms. Nixon told Selina: "Now, I'm going to show you some letters. I want you to tell me the name of the letter and the sound that it makes. OK."
"That one is kind of hard."
Ms. Nixon: "That's OK."
Ms. Nixon set that card aside and showed Selina the next card.
"A"
Ms. Nixon: "What does 'A' say?"
"(6 seconds) [ei]" (note: should be [A])
Ms. Nixon showed the next card.
Selina could not answer.
Ms. Nixon: "That's OK. How about this one?"
"P, [pa]"
Ms. Nixon: "What does P say? P-"
"[pa]"
Ms. Nixon: "Good."
"H [ha]. T."
Ms. Nixon: "What does T say?"
(11 seconds) "[ta]"
Ms. Nixon: "Good girl."
"N [?], S"
Ms. Nixon: "[s]"
"Z."
Ms. Nixon: "And the sound?"
"[za]"
Ms. Nixon: "Good girl."

> Ms. Nixon put the cards of the letters, A, P, T, N, S, and Z at a separate pile. Ms. Nixon wrote down the letter sounds that Selina could not make on the first column of the "Reading" section of the report card.

Thirdly, Ms. Nixon liked to conduct the interview assessment with the same format. Ms. Nixon believed that this would make the assessment fair to all the students. For example, when assessing letter names and sounds, Ms. Nixon developed a test sheet to assess letters and sounds. Ms. Nixon showed the same test sheet to all students individually, pointed to each letter on the sheet, and asked for its letter name or sound(s). On her own recording sheet (same as the test sheet), Ms. Nixon crossed out the letters and sounds that the student missed[2].

Ms. Nixon showed a beginning (Arabic ESL) writer's journal to the class, and asked for the students' opinion to improve the story. This was a form of peer review because students did not use a set of evaluative criteria to assess their own work.

> (Data source: 97Nixon 1034-1039) 10/6/97
> Ms. Nixon sat at the front of the room. She picked up one dictated story, held up high, and asked the class, "Who wrote this story?"
> Herman rose his hand.
> Ms. Nixon: "How can Herman make this story better?"
> Some one said the story should say who the character(s) is (are).
>
> (Data source: 97Nixon 1567-1569) 10/13/97
> One week later, Ms. Nixon held up Herman's story again and asked for suggestion to improve Herman's story, "What can Herman do to make the story even better?"
> Some one said, "Give the girls names."

---

[2] Ms. Nixon kept the recording sheets. Two weeks later, Ms. Nixon re-assessed the letters and/or sounds that the student could not name or sound. Later, Ms. Nixon changed one procedure. Instead of pointing to the letters for students, Ms. Nixon asked the student to point to each letter and say the letter name or sounds. This way, the student could take his/her time to respond. (Data sources: 98Nixon 1134-1146; 520-580; 682-686; 1425-1456; 3170-3186) (Note: For the 1997 winter report card, Ms. Nixon only checked the letters and sounds and did not ask the student to read a book.)

Rupert explained why the girl needed a name: "If you say 'girl' then both of them will come."

I noticed that Ms. Nixon did not inform students of the district evaluative criteria or assessment results (to facilitate students' ability of taking charge of their own learning). When students were not able to perform, Ms. Nixon simply told the student to skip the question. Maybe it was unnecessary to reveal all the information to kindergarten young children, because it might cause student anxiety.

(Data source: 98Nixon 808-823)
In an interview assessment, Rupert was tested the letter names.
Rupert said, "M P S R A (Note: should be I) Q, I forget (Note: should be J)."
Ms. Nixon: "OK. J."
"J W L K"

Ms. Nixon: "Good. Try that row."
"Y Z U T X Z."
Ms. Nixon crossed out I and J on her sheet.
Ms. Nixon: "Great. OK. Now the little ones."
"m a r f n t c e o b"
Ms. Nixon: "OK. Great. Try the next row."
Rupert asked Ms. Nixon what she was writing.
Ms. Nixon replied, "Just thinking of things that I want to teach."

Ms. Nixon said that she kept writing samples in a portfolio for each student. As mentioned before, Ms. Nixon's students wrote earnestly throughout the year. They started writing journals three times a week in December 1997. They were asked to draw a picture and write a sentence in their best kids' spelling (data source: Ms. Nixon's newsletter to parents dated December 5, 1997). Ms. Nixon's class also had "Creative Writing," a special writing activity, on Fridays. Students were asked from October through December 1997 to dictate a story for a picture and for the rest of the school year to dictate their own story (data source: 97Nixon 1047-1053). I also saw the Writing/Reading Development Continuum that Ms. Nixon passed on to a first grade

teacher, which indicated that Ms. Nixon kept an assessment file/portfolio for each student.

Communication

There was not much teacher-to-teacher discussion on assessments (as far as I knew of), except Ms. Nixon seemed to have a close relationship with the next door teacher, Ms. Kennedy, the other kindergarten teacher. As discussed earlier, Ms. Nixon mentioned that while she was struggling with a working system to organize her observational notes, Ms. Kennedy suggested that Nixon simply document all of her observation in the report card. Ms. Nixon took the advice and solved her problem (data source: 98Nixon 4948).

On the other hand, teacher-parent(s) communication was excellent in Ms. Nixon's class. Ms. Nixon took the opportunity of face-to-face teacher-parent conferences to clarify the information on the report card, to provide evidence of student learning needs/progress, and to develop a work plan with parents to improve student learning. Ms. Nixon said, "I went over the report cards and answered questions. We also talked about ideas that they could help their kids" (data source: 5306-5307).

Ms. Nixon said that she raised the standard, so she added notes to the report card to inform parents of the specific skills that the student had acquired. Ms. Nixon told me, "I sent them a note on the report card three times a year. I explained that the outcomes are very low for kindergartners so I have my own personal goals" (Data source: 98Nixon 2905- 2905).

Ms. Nixon also mentioned that she wanted parents to have accurate information about their child's learning. Ms. Nixon said: "I want the parents to know as much as the information that I know. And, I'll write a handful of comments on each report card. I'll write little notes. Things that they can do to help them get specific targets" (data source: 98Nixon 2958-2964).

Two points can be made here. First, the reading/writing rubrics seemed to work as a conceptual framework for Ms. Nixon to understand, observe, and document student performance, and to discuss assessment results with parents as reported. Nonetheless, the mere existence and the use of rubrics may not automatically provide teachers with information about student performance. Some quality-control procedures are crucial—teachers may need to adjust task difficulty to match student proficiency levels. For example, only when Ms. Nixon changed the assessment procedure to match her student Ernest's advanced reading proficiency level, could Ernest's reading ability be appropriately assessed.

Second, the autonomous feature of the assessment program seemed to allow Ms. Nixon to develop/improve her assessment practices. For example, Ms. Nixon adopted an effective data-organization system which was accompanied by her strategies to concentrate on targeted students, reflect on student questions, and use interview assessment alternatively. In addition, Ms. Nixon planned ahead for the assessments, used flexible grouping activities, gradually increased cognitive demand of tasks, and used the assessment results for her own self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

The autonomous feature that teachers did not have control over assessment design but only scoring, data gathering, and evaluation, is common in lower-grade performance

assessment programs, such as, the Work Sampling System (Dorfman, 1997), Early Literacy Portfolio (Salinger, 1998), and Primary Language Record (Khattri et al., 1998). Nonetheless, this feature did not automatically make teachers become "systematic (assessment) planners" as described in Gipps et al. (1995). That is, setting aside concentrated time for assessments; integrating observation, work sampling, and questioning; and continuously gathering informed about student performance. I wonder whether teacher personality and teacher partnership played a role, given the facts that the Ms. Nixon was not engaged in peer discussion with other teachers (except the next door teacher) on assessment practices and the technical assistance provided by the District was voluntary (as mentioned in Chapter Four). That is, I wonder whether a goal-oriented personality and the intent to self evaluate reinforce the effectiveness of standard-referenced performance assessment programs; and whether consulting with a teaching partner is more significant than engaging in extended discussion with a group of teachers.

Information Gained from Rubrics

The content of the rubrics covered a wide range of ability/skill levels and seemed to provide specific details for teachers to locate student reading and writing skills. Ms. Nixon said: "I do like the reading continuum because I can place each child where they are. I really like that" (data source: 98Nixon 4079). Through the process of comparing student performance against the rubrics, Ms. Nixon believed that she was informed about student learning progress on the continua and specific skills students possessed.

Ms. Nixon seemed to be satisfied that the rubrics captured a variety of student performance, which helped her identify and keep track of student growth over time.

(Data source: 98Nixon 4906)
"The assessment program provides, like I said, very detailed information, very detailed skills. You know, this child has sight words. This child can sound out. This child can write, can think about topics, and/or can record ideas."

In the end-of-project interview, Ms. Nixon commented on her use of the rubrics on one student (Neville) and others' reading assessment as follows:

(Data source: 98Nixon 4898-4903)
"It was neat to watch that evolved. He was, I don't want to say typical, a very typical kindergartner, in the way that he progresses through the reading program. He's doing reading now. If you hand him a first-grader reader, he will read it for you. He uses everything. He uses words, picture clues, sounding out, which is neat to see. He progresses through the continuum just like he's supposed to."

Specifically, Ms. Nixon marked the outcomes she observed on the report card by writing down the month and year by that specific item. Ms. Nixon also wrote down the book(s) (series) that the students were able to read.

(Data source: 98Nixon 3333-3363)
The following was the marking of Peter's report card:
Reading-
All items of "Pre-Emergent" were checked in 10/97.
All except #4 and #8 of "Emergent" (Kindergarten grade level) were check in 3/98 and 5/98.

Note:
#4: Reads some names and words.
#8: Remains interested in self-chosen books.

Ms. Nixon also checked #4 and #5 of "Developing" (one level above the grade level):

Note:
#4: Identifies all upper and lower case letters.
#5: Knows most letter sounds.

At the bottom of the Reading section was: "Reads books such as."
Ms. Nixon wrote: "Class Books" in Fall (1997);
"Writing Senses Books Mrs. Harris Class Books" in Winter (1998),
and "A Pig Can Jig Macmillan Class Book" in Spring (1998).

Writing-

All items of "Pre-Emergent" were checked in 10/97.
All items of "Emergent" (grade level) were checked in 3/98 and 5/98.
#1 and #2 of "Developing" were checked.

Note:
#1: Reads own writing
#2: Writes from left to right, top to bottom.

Spelling-
All items of Pre-Phonetic (There is only one item) was checked on 10/97.
All items of Semi-Phonetic (grade level) were also checked on 3/98 and 5/98.

Guided by rubrics, Ms. Nixon appeared to keep notes while she observed her students read and write. The data below indicates that Ms. Nixon's note taking was not limited to mathematics, but included student reading and writing.

(Data source: 98Nixon 3004-3028)
Ms. Nixon: "We've done graphing since the very beginning of the school. The last month and a half I kept very good notes. That was the last period of graphing activity I did for the assessment."
Ashley asked: "So you collect notes--"
Ms. Nixon: "I have some [notes] at home. I have a note book keeping all of my little notes. I just have to go through them. The last two weeks I have gone around to see who could write, who's writing their own story without any help from the adults.

In summary, it appeared that the rubrics worked as quick references to guide Ms. Nixon's data/information collection practices. Clearly, the rubrics captured a variety of student performances, which helped Ms. Nixon identify, keep track of, and evaluate student growth over time. Nonetheless, the information obtained in the present study seemed to be limited to what students knew and could do (Herman et al., 1992) and did not illustrate student higher order thinking in dealing with complexity and judgment as claimed by Resnick and Resnick (1996).

Use of Information/Assessment Results

Ms. Nixon did not feel that the District or Principal would use the assessment results against teachers or that she would not be promoted or punished because of the assessment results. Ms. Nixon said that the Principal read all the report cards before they were sent out (data source: 97Nixon 2504-2505) and she did not feel any pressure from the Principal or the District. Ms. Nixon said students may have a bad day, just like all of us do, and not perform well, so the information obtained from the assessment should not be used against teachers (data source: 97Nixon 2498-2500).

Ms. Nixon believed that the assessment helped her "accurately pinpoint" student learning on reading because students came into kindergarten with a variety of reading skills—"With the continuum, you can really pinpoint where they are" (data source: 98Nixon 4886-4890). Ms. Nixon told me in the end-of-project interview that she did not have any problems using the assessment results in her classroom. Ms. Nixon said the information obtained from the assessment informed her of student learning status and needs.

Ms. Nixon mainly used the information obtained from the assessments in four ways. First, Ms. Nixon used the information to make pedagogical decisions, for example, grouping--asking parent helpers to play games to reinforce target skills with small groups of students who had a specific learning need.

> (Data source: 98Nixon 4991-4998)
> Ms. Nixon: "I just- I find it very focus and shows me who's doing what, and where we need working. I used the information to create small groups by having a number of children who have difficulty with letter recognition to work with parent volunteers. I have a number of parent volunteers. I gave them games or something that they can play with those specific students. It really helps me group the children and helps me use my parents more effectively."
> Ashley asked: "How do you use your parents more effectively?"

> Ms. Nixon: "For instance, because of the assessment, I have been able to put my children to reading groups. I have mothers who come in and read with children twice a week. They have readers and read whatever level that child is at. The children have been read with on their level and the assessment helped me track that. If the children weren't reading, the parents would play letter games with them. I'm just using parent volunteers to my best advantage where my kids need the most help."

Second, Ms. Nixon used the assessment results to decide her teaching content. For example, based on the assessment for the June (1998) report card, Ms. Nixon was informed that the majority of students had reached the kindergarten standards, so Ms. Nixon decided to teach first grade content, for example, sight words. On May 19, 1998, one month before the school year was over, Ms. Nixon said that she would concentrate on the sight words that were in the second stack of the assessment word cards, because most of her students had not acquired those words yet (data source: 98Nixon 4057-4062).

Third, Ms. Nixon treated the assessment results as an indication of her own teaching effectiveness. Ms. Nixon was self-motivated and set her own goals. Thus, Ms. Nixon needed to constantly evaluate her own teaching in order to decide whether she should take the next step or back track on specific aspects of teaching content.

> (Data source: 98Nixon 4980-4980)
> (In the end-of-project interview) Ms. Nixon: "I would say that the information I gained helps me teach tremendously in that I know if there is anything I need to go back and re-teach. It shows me what I'm strong in my teaching and where I am weak. It shows me what vocabulary I need to review, or if I have done a good job."

> (Data source: 98Nixon 4984-4989)
> (In the end-of-project interview) Ms. Nixon: "I look at my overall class, and, if the majority of my class are successful through the information I obtained, then I felt that I have done a good teaching job. By 'majority,' I mean 98% of my kids."
> Ashley: "OK."
> Ms. Nixon: "I set very high standards for my students and for myself. If more than . . . we go back and re-do some of it. That is just my own personal checking. I want ALL of my kids hit the targets, not just 50% of them.

Fourth, Ms. Nixon passed on assessment results to parents and provided learning material for parents to help their child. Ms. Nixon told me that during the parent-teacher conference (for the November report card), she went over the report cards and answered parent questions. Ms. Nixon told parents some ideas that could help their child learn at home (data source: 97Nixon 5306-5307). For example, after assessing a struggling reader, Herman, Ms. Nixon told me that she would send home some packages of sounds (for reading), shapes and counting (for mathematics) games so that Herman's parents could help him learn at home (97Nixon 3817-1818).

Fifth, as mentioned before, Ms. Nixon seemed to have autonomy to use the assessment results to decide retention. For example, Ms. Nixon mentioned to me that Herman did not obtain any help at home with letters or sounds and that was not acceptable—"So, I'm going to recommend retention, if this child did not get better quickly. He is immature as well as lacking skills, and I can't send him to the first grade. I'm afraid he will get lost" (98Nixon 2934-2943).

In summary, Ms. Nixon appreciated the detailed information obtained from the assessments. She constantly collected information of student learning and immediately responded to the information. Ms. Nixon wanted the parents to be accurately informed about their child's performance in class and to share the responsibility to improve their child's learning. Ms. Nixon used the assessment results to use parent volunteers to reinforce target skills, to decide teaching content, to evaluate her own teaching effectiveness, to communicate with parents, and to consider retention. Ms. Nixon did not feel the threat of a political use of the assessment results.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

With reference to the literature reviewed earlier, there are two points to be made here. First, Ms. Nixon mainly used the information obtained to consider remedial activities to improve struggling student learning, to keep track of student progress, and to decide her whole-class teaching content and pace. Nonetheless, it is hard to say that Ms. Nixon *tailored* instructional content and strategies to match the ability and skill level of *individual* students as claimed by Marzano (1995) and Gullo (1994). That is, I wonder whether what Falk (1994) suggests is true—through observation and documentation, teachers who use performance assessments tend to become sensible and responsive to student diverse learning style. In my study, it seemed that teachers might be very sensible and informed about student diverse learning style and progress but did not actually respond to the information with individualized instruction. Their response might be limited to reinforcement (e.g., development of remedial teaching activities) of teaching content, instead of rethinking of their teaching strategies.

Second, Ms. Nixon mainly discussed the assessment results with parents to seek their assistance at home. Ms. Nixon did not provide specific instructional recommendations for other teachers as reported in Falk (1998) or discuss the results with the next year teachers as in Salinger (1998). In fact, peer discussion about assessment practices and results was rare in the present study. It seemed that time pressure hindered peer discussion and direct communication seemed to facilitate student learning in an immediate fashion.

Ms. Carter

Profile

Ms. Carter is a first-grade teacher. Ms. Carter has been teaching for 14 years. Ms. Carter has a bachelor in education, a master's in alternative curriculum, and she also has two Montessori certificates—one is from birth to three and the other from three to six. Ms. Carter is also national board certified in all subjects up to grade two. Ms. Carter has state certification from State of "M" K-8 for all classrooms and K-9 on music" (data source: 98Carter 3888-3891). The 1997-98 school year was Ms. Carter's fifth year of using the K-2 Performance Assessment Program (data source: 98Carter 4053-4054).

On October 24, 1997, Ms. Carter and 13 other teachers from the State of "M" and (two from "Adams" Public Schools) were invited to a ceremony recognizing the work of "The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards" (tenth anniversary of the organization) in Washington D.C. During the conference, the group met with President Clinton (data source: 97Carter 1149 and 1581-1583). In May 1998, Ms. Carter was granted the "Fulbright Memorial Fund Teacher Program Grant" to visit Japan for three weeks. She visited schools and government in Japan with other 200 K-2 teachers from the U.S. (data source: 98Carter 2708-2709).

Ms. Carter is a compassionate teacher, who is sensible about student special needs, for example, the parental care that students received and student personality. Furthermore, Ms. Carter values her individual time with students highly and is willing to provide additional assistance.

Assessment Practices

Integration

Ms. Carter integrated the portfolio assessment into classroom writing routines. Every morning Ms. Carter collected and checked student writing and then posted it on the bulletin board (data source: 97Carter 1764-1765 and 97Carter 85). At the end of the month, each student had his/her own stack of writing samples on the wall. Writing samples could be journals (personal reflections), stories (summaries of stories that Ms. Carter or her student teacher read to the students), or any topic that was assigned by Ms. Carter. For example, the topics of October journals included "Spot Goes To The Circus" (October 26, 1997), "Spot Goes To The Beach" (October 27, 1997), a letter to President Clinton, and about a trip to the White House (data source: 97Carter 1365-1366).

Besides writing, Ms. Carter also arranged activities to assess how students responded to teacher-directed activities. "Following directions" was one of the assessment items under the category of "Learning and Social Behaviors" on the report card. I observed Ms. Carter tell the class to draw anything they wanted for President Clinton (for Ms. Carter's trip to the White House). Ms. Carter said, "You can draw a picture of the President if you want." Ms. Carter then told the class to: (1) put their name at the bottom; (2) hold paper this way (width way); and (3) fill the whole page. Later Ms. Carter told me that she took this opportunity to assess which students could follow directions (data source: 97Carter 1225-1235).

In summary, it appeared that Ms. Carter integrated the portfolio assessment and classroom observation into her regular classroom activities. It seemed that Ms. Carter

focused on what she was required to assess (e.g., reading, writing, and following directions) and collected data when students were engaged in learning activities.

Data Sources

Ms. Carter commented that assessing writing and reading took time because information needed to be collected over time. Ms. Carter said that she collected and reviewed student writing samples to assess writing, and she gave students different books to read and checked her notes on the reading log to assess reading (data source: 130-131). This practice was clearly what the District expected teachers to do—to collect writing and reading data from multiple books/sources over time.

Specifically, Ms. Carter listened to, evaluated, collected, and systematically posted student journals/stories almost everyday (data source: 97Carter 85 and 793-802). Ms. Carter said that, for each month, she had a writing sample to show student growth (data source: 133-134). Ms. Carter used the writing samples of September, October, and November for the November report card; samples of January, February, and March for the March report card; and samples of April, Mary, and June for the June report card. On March 16, 1998, Ms. Carter had three samples of each student's writing in front of her when she assessed student writing for the March report card (data source: 98btx 1017-1018).

Ms. Carter appeared to consider everyday writing when she graded student writing. On March 16, 1998, when grading Amy's writing, Ms. Carter stated that she marked Amy's writing at the Beginning level (first-grade target) and her decision was not

just based on 'The Three Little Pigs' writing assignment[3]. The assignment was among the three writing samples that Ms. Carter collected. Ms. Carter said that her grading decision was based on what Amy wrote everyday. Ms. Carter told me that Amy's writing was very creative (data source: 1295-1299).

Ms. Carter also included sources such as her observation of student writing process as well as her interactions with the students to assess writing. On March 16, 1998, when grading Hollie's writing, Ms. Carter told me that Hollie had two to three of the conventions for proofreading: capitalization, punctuation, and spelling (#6 Outcome of writing process at the Expanding level), "She does that only when I ask her to. She won't do that on her own" (data source: 98Carter 1441-1442)." Ms. Carter recalled that [Hollie] did not like to revise (#8 Outcome of writing process at the Expanding level)—"I mean it's very hard to get her to go back and add more or do more. In fact, it's hard to get work done. Sometimes she is very methodical, very slow. It took a whole morning and part of lunch to get all of this down." (data source 98Carter 1475-1481). Ms. Carter also commented that Hollie did not think of the audience when she wrote (#2 Outcome of writing process at the Expanding level). "Because she would have changed based on the comments that I made about her work, everything I wrote for her. Right now she doesn't do that" (data source: 98Carter 1446-1454).

When assessing reading, Ms. Carter also referred to multiple data sources, such as her reflections on the student performance and her own written record. On the same day she talked about Hollie, Ms. Carter said her student Karin used phonetic clues when she

[3] In that assignment, students listened to the story "The Three Little Pigs (by Paul Galdone) and re-wrote the story with their own version of ending (data source: 1228-1229).

read, and was reading so much better than the beginning of the year. Ms. Carter then checked her reading log and told me,

> (data source: 98Carter 2438-2457)
> "She didn't have any phonics at the beginning of the year, and couldn't sound out words without help--three letter words. In October she still couldn't sound out words. [Karin] read this one, 'Where Is Mat?' in the middle of November but couldn't sound out 'Mat.' So, she's come a long way."

Ms. Carter seemed to be careful about basing conclusions on concrete evidence. Ms. Carter was thinking about marking Hollie on the fourth Outcome of writing process at the Expanding level ("Listens to peers' writing with positive comments and requests for additional information"). Then Ms. Carter recalled that Hollie only asked regular questions. Ms. Carter commented, "She is very quiet, very shy and she may be thinking. But she's not expressing any of it. Since I have never heard it, I don't know if she's making connections."

To summarize, Ms. Carter seemed to consider student everyday writing, specially assigned writing samples, and student writing attitudes as her data sources when assessing writing. When assessing reading, Ms. Carter seemed to use her written documentation source to triangulate her memory of student reading performance over time.

Assessment Methods

Ms. Carter observed her students closely. Ms. Carter did not seem to just collect data for reading and writing assessments, but examined student learning needs on all aspects. On September 30, 1997, one month after school started, Ms. Carter told me that she noticed that one of her students, Sam, only mouth read when he read with a group.

Ms. Carter said, "There was no sound coming out from his mouth but his lips were moving" (data source: 97Carter 701-702). Later, Ms. Carter put Sam in a small reading group (of 4). Ms. Carter stated that she wanted to establish Sam's self-confidence by asking Sam to read aloud to hear his own voice.

Student progress seemed to be particularly noticeable to Ms. Carter. Ms. Carter noticed one of her students, Neil's, problem with writing. Based on her persistent observation and deliberation, Ms. Carter discussed Neil's problem with me,

> (Data source: 98Carter 1322-1340)
> "Neil is very bright and he can write pages and pages but he is concerned about doing it right. He sits all morning and doesn't put down anything including the title, because he wants the story right. It's taken me this long to figure that out. I just think what is going on with Neil. I said to him, 'You don't need to put everything in words.' I have been talking to his mom. Neil realized it and I realized it. He took all morning to write the first page and five minutes to write the second page. It's taken me this long to figure out why. I know he can do it. He can tell me the story but he can't get it on the paper because he wants all the details. He doesn't know how to narrow down and to give you a highlight. He wants to do it all. He may have a photographic memory. I don't know. If I ask for a summary or a different version, sometimes it takes him a while."

To conclude, Ms. Carter indicated that observation was the assessment method that she trusted the most, "One part of that is because it's the way that I was trained" (data source: 3995-4003 and 4009). It appeared that Ms. Carter adopted a broad data collection practice through in-class observation and dialogue to examine student reading, writing, and learning needs in general.

Interview/Pullout assessments seemed to become a routine each time when the report cards were due in Ms. Carter' classroom, although the District did not mandate them as absolute procedures. Ms. Carter expressed her need to assess student reading individually, even though she seemed to observe students closely during the reading

group and regular instruction. Ms. Carter told me that she did not trust group assessments, especially in reading. Ms. Carter said that a teacher could not tell if someone was doing mouth reading or could really read. Ms. Carter cited an example of a child (Danny) who, though rated as a good reader, in fact memorized 2 pages of the material and could only recognize 8 letters. Ms. Carter said that she had to listen to each child read, one at a time. Ms. Carter believed that the pullout/interview reading assessment was the essential part of the assessment program (data source: 97Carter 130-130 and 798).

Later in the pullout reading assessment for the June (1998) report card, Ms. Carter reemphasized the importance of assessing reading individually. Ms. Carter pointed out that only by listening to ESL students read individually, could she identify their reading problem—whether it was vocabulary and/or cultural concepts that caused comprehension difficulty. Ms. Carter said,

> (Data source: 98Carter 3869- 3876)
> "Because with the ESL students, sometimes listening to them read I realized that they don't understand what they are reading; either it is the vocabulary or even a concept. Sometimes by hearing them read, I can tell whether it's the word or idea that they might not understand, because they don't have the background vocabulary. In the group, it's just not that noticeable."

Several characteristics were featured in Ms. Carter's interview assessments. First, Ms. Carter only assessed student reading on the material that was not memorized. In the following data, Ms. Carter asked the student to change to another book as soon as Ms. Carter found out that the student read the book before. In a personal communication with Ms. Carter (December 3, 1999), she explained to me that "Usually books read with mom

are viewed as practiced," and her reason to ask the student to read another book was simply "to get a better feel" of the student's reading.

> (Data source: 97Carter 1860-1867)
> Sally picked up a book from the bookshelf in the classroom and came to Ms. Carter for the reading assessment. Ms. Carter was sitting at the back of the classroom, while the student teacher, Melody, was teaching. Ms. Carter welcomed Sally, "I have not heard you read for a while." Ms. Carter looked at the book that Sally picked, and asked, "Did you read that for your mom?" Sally's mother often came to Ms. Carter's classroom and listened to students read individually. "Yes," replied Sally. Ms. Carter told Sally to go back and choose a different book.

Second, Ms. Carter conducted extensive one-on-one reading assessments. Ms. Carter often asked students to read a whole story. When the students had little problem finishing the first story, Ms. Carter would ask them to read another more challenging story. This might help Ms. Carter identify the student's reading proficiency level and find out the student's reading problem. In the data numbered 97Carter 2190 – 2254, for example, Scarlett read "The New Hat" and did not seem to have any problem. Ms. Carter wrote down the title of the book "The New Hat" on the reading log and then asked Scarlett: "Would you like to take a book out of the blue basket. In case there is a book there you like to read."

Third, Ms. Carter often asked students questions when listening to them read. Ms. Carter asked about the pictures before students actually read the text. I wonder if Ms. Carter tried to teach students to use picture cues, or to help the student be ready for the story that s/he was about to read (so that they can read more fluently and comprehend better?)

> (Data source: 97Carter 1872-1887)
> Sally picked the book, "The Little Runaway" (by Margaret Hillert), and came back to Ms. Carter.

The story started on page six. Ms. Carter looked at the picture on pages six and seven (text: "Here is a mother. Here is a little baby"), and asked, "Where is the mother? Where is the mother on the page?" Sally pointed at the picture.
Ms. Carter: "Where is the baby?"
Sally pointed at the picture.
Ms. Carter: "And another baby?"
"Yeah-s"
Ms. Carter: "How many babies are there on that page?"
"Fou-r."
Ms. Carter: "Four babies? Where are they?"
Sally pointed at the pictures.
Ms. Carter: "Count, I didn't see the white one. OK. Go ahead."

Ms. Carter also asked questions when there was a natural break in the material (e.g., end of a page). Ms. Carter usually asked questions about the pictures and checked students' comprehension. Ms. Carter seemed eager to find out whether the student comprehended every chunk of the story. When the student finished reading, Ms. Carter usually asked her/him: "What is the story about?" There may be two purposes for Ms. Carter' questioning. One is to assess the student's comprehension. The other is to teach or model how a good reader would use the picture cues in the process of reading and would conclude a story at the end of reading.

(Data source: 97Carter 1890-1938)
Sally read: Down, down, down. See something come down. It's fun to play here (p. 15). Look up, up, up. See the little balls. Little and red" (p. 16).
Ms. Carter asked Sally about the picture on page 16, "What are they?"
Sally: "Apples."
Ms. Carter: "Do you think the baby would know?"
Sally said something.
Ms. Carter: "Go ahead."
Sally continued to read: "Oh my oh my. It is not funny (p. 17). Here is something blue. I can look down in it (p. 18). Help, help! (p. 19)"

Ms. Carter asked Sally again, "What happened? Why is he saying help?"
Sally: " He . . ."
Ms. Carter: "He what?"
"He- in the water."
Ms. Carter: "Yes. Do cats like water? (falling tone)"

"My dad likes it . . "
Ms. Carter: "Hm- but cats? No-"
Sally laughed.

At the end of the reading, Ms. Carter asked Sally, "Could you tell me what this story is about?"
"A cat . . . to run away."
Ms. Carter: "And what did he feel when he ran away?"
"A . . . came right out . . . He meets the squirrel."
Ms. Carter: "Hm- What else did he see?"
"m- . . ."
Ms. Carter: "The leaves. What else did he see?"
". . . falling down on him."
Ms. Carter: "Yes. Did he like running away?"
"Yes."
Ms. Carter: "Yes?"
"At the end, he doesn't."
Ms. Carter: "He doesn't. What did he do at the end?"
"He [headed] back home."
Ms. Carter: "OK. Thank you, Sally."

In Spring 1998, Ms. Carter's questions seemed to focus on assessing students' ability in identifying story elements: the setting, characters, problem, and resolution. This is #5 reading outcome of Expanding Comprehension in the rubric.

(Data source: 98Carter 3298-3402 and 3602-3623)
Sally looked at the table of contents and selected "Who's talking, Elena?" (pp. 118-130 of the reading textbook) to read. Ms. Carter wrote down the title of the story and looked at the text while Sally was reading. Ms. Carter turned and pressed the pages for Sally.
After Sally read, Ms. Carter asked Sally: "Who are the characters?"
"Elena, Bossy, and Lickety-Split."
Ms. Carter: "Where is the setting?"
" . . . "
Ms. Carter: "Is there a problem?"
"She can't decide [what to buy]."
Ms. Carter: "Have you read this story before?"
" . . . "
Ms. Carter: "How did it end?"
"She bought a book."
Ms. Carter: "Which toy would you buy?"
"Booker."
Ms. Carter: "Do you have a lot of books at home?"
"Yes."

Fourth, Ms. Carter often prompted when students experienced difficulty. In a personal communication (December 3, 1999), Ms. Carter explained to me: "When a child experiences difficulty, I often switch to a teaching mode and prompt. The student is then assessed again at a later date [before the report card was due]."

(Data source: 97Carter 2256-2408)
Scarlett came back with a book (after she read "The New Hat").
Ms. Carter: "What is the title of that book?"
"The Happy Egg."
Ms. Carter: "OK."
Ms. Carter wrote down the title of the book in the reading log.
Scarlett read, "There was a [le tou]? [le tou] (7 seconds; 'little')"
Ms. Carter: "Keep going."
Scarlett read: "It was (16 seconds) just (5 seconds)?"
Ms. Carter: "It was just what (5 seconds)?" Ms. Carter sounded out for Scarlett: "[ba or n]"
"Brown?"
Ms. Carter: "Born. Born."
"Born. It (6 seconds) sit? (5 seconds)"
Ms. Carter: "Still"
"Still was (8 seconds) an egg."
Ms. Carter: "Excellent! Read it again."
"It was just born. It [si tal]?"
Ms. Carter: "Still."
"Still was an an egg still."

I observed that although Ms. Carter prompted, she still collected preliminary information of the student's reading skills and comprehension. Ms. Carter noted that Scarlett was able to use picture cues ("because she looked at pictures while she read"), was able to retell the story at the end but not during the story, and had some sight vocabulary. On the report card, Ms. Carter marked Scarlett's reading between the "Developing" and Beginning" levels, and wrote a note on Scarlett's report card, "Some expression, able to explain writing & pictures, no fingers, slowly sounding out" (data

source: 97Carter 2422-2428). As indicated above, Ms. Carter might re-assess Scarlett and decide her final marking later.

Fifth, I noticed that Ms. Carter conducted remedial teaching on beginner readers during pullout reading assessments. Ms. Carter gave students three to four books to read, encouraged sounding-out, asked about context, phonetic and punctuation clues, reinforced one-on-one correspondence, prompted re-reading for self-correction, and checked comprehension at the end of the reading.

Ms. Carter seemed to look at students' progression on reading as a long journey and Ms. Carter would provide assistance and reinforcement whenever she could, even during the assessment. Ms. Carter seemed to use the individual reading assessment to fulfill several purposes--to identify the student's reading skills and proficiency level, to establish student's self confidence on reading, to reinforce reading skills, and to ensure that the student's learning on reading continued, as shown in the data below.

> (Data source: 98Carter 1858 – 2115)
> Marius read: "I want a dog. I want a dog. No, I want a pet (note: Marius self corrected), said Mr. Dog. I do too, said Mrs. Dog. We will we will"
> Ms. Carter: "Where are you?"
> Marius pointed the word "Let's"
> Ms. Carter: "What did it say?" "M- will?"
> Ms. Carter: "You can separate them. L [la]" "M-"
> Ms. Carter: "Sound it out. What does L say?" "[la]"
> Ms. Carter: "What does E say?" "[e]"
> Ms. Carter: "What does T say?" "[t]"
> Ms. Carter: "What's that word?" "[let]"
> Ms. Carter: "And the apostrophe s." "Let's," Marius said right away.
> Ms. Carter read: "Let's go to the pet shop."
>
> Ms. Carter: "Keep going. (1 second) Point to where you are. What's the word?" "M- want?"
> Ms. Carter: "What" "What a fine what a fine um- bird, said Mr. Dog," Marius read.

> At the end of the reading, Ms. Carter asked: "Good. How many stories are you reading every day? Can you do this? It's called 'The Magic Beans."
> Ms. Carter opened the book of The Magic Beans.
>
> Later Ms. Carter switched to the book "Where is Nat?" because Marius read "The Magic Beans" to Ms. Carter before, according to Ms. Carter's reading log. Marius seemed to have difficulty reading "Where is Nat?"
>
> At the end, Ms. Carter gave Marius the fourth book "Up Up Up In The Way" to read. Marius seemed to have more difficulty than when he read "Where is Nat?" Marius could not read 'this' 'here' 'something' and 'what' in the opening sentence of "Look at this. Here is something big. What is it? What can it do?" Ms. Carter told Marius to take the book "Up Up In The Way" home to practice.

Later, Ms. Carter explained to me: "Marius doesn't like the fact that he can't read. He is convinced that he can't do it. And he is practically capable of sounding out short vowels. That's why I gave him more than one book to read. I'm trying to get him plenty of opportunity to practice."

It should be noted that Ms. Carter is a compassionate teacher and the pullout reading assessment seemed to fit with her style of teaching. Ms. Carter even worked on her attitude, way of talking, when she interacted with individual students.

> (Data source: 98Carter 4004-4007)
> (In the end-of-project interview, I asked Ms. Carter if she needed to do anything different when she assessed ESL students. Ms. Carter replied--)
> "Adjusting the assessment method is not particular to ESL students. I try to find whatever works for each child, even attitude. Brad loves me babbling. And Hollie would like me to talk with her very seriously. She can't handle it when I talk too much. But babbling works for Brad. And Brad just lights up."

To conclude, Ms. Carter interpreted the pullout reading assessment as an opportunity to "sit down and talk with each child individually three times a year" (data source: 98Carter 3901), to "have them come up to me and read to me one-on-one" (data source: 98Carter 3935), and to screen out noise and to hear the real voice of the students (data source: 98Carter 3991). In the end-of-project interview, Ms. Carter insisted: "I

don't want them (note: the District) to take the time (note: for interview assessments) away. I'll continue to collect data whenever I can but I still want the individual time to assess" (data source: 98Carter 3993).

Ms. Carter conducted student self-assessments but mainly for students to identify their own progress. I observed Ms. Carter ask a student to compare two pieces of work from different times and to identify which piece was of more work (one criteria that Ms. Carter gave). Ms. Carter then encouraged the student, specified the student's improvement, and sought the student's re-confirmation that he had made progress.

(Data source: 97Cartert 1485-1527)
In an interview assessment, Ms. Carter showed Roy his own writing sample that was taken from the beginning of the school year.
Roy asked: "What's that?"
Ms. Carter: "Your first day of writing. You have three letters on that page. Do you think you learn more since you started the first grade?"
"Hm"
Ms. Carter: "Look at what you've done in one semester!"
Ms. Carter showed Roy the journal that he had just wrote that morning.
Ms. Carter: "Maybe you've done that a little bit better?"
"What?"
Ms. Carter: "Do you feel the difference between this two work?"
"No."
Ms. Carter: "You don't see a difference?" Ms. Carter showed Roy the two pages of writing. Look, there's more work there."
"I know."
Ms. Carter: "So, you feel there is a little bit difference between these two?"
"I know."
Ms. Carter: "Which is more work?"
Roy did not answer.
Ms. Carter: "Which one?"
"More work?"
Ms. Carter: "Which is better?"
Roy pointed at the one he wrote that morning.
Ms. Carter: "Right. This is from the first day of school. Look at this (Note: Ms. Carter turned to the recent one.) Do you think you have come a long way?"
Roy nodded.

> Ms. Carter: "I think so too, Roy. I think you are doing a great job. Look at that! 'I played with' you didn't even finish your sentence. Here you have one, two, three, four sentences."
> "I didn't have enough time. That's why."
> Ms. Carter: "Yes, but that was a whole morning. This is a whole morning (Note: Ms. Carter pointed at the paper). Look, how much work you've got!"
> "A lot more."
> Ms. Carter: "A lot more. Do you think maybe you've learned more . . .?"
> "Hm-"
> Ms. Carter: "Excellent. OK. Have a seat."

In an interview assessment for the June (1998) report card, Ms. Carter also used the same technique to illustrate to a good writer her progress on writing.

> (Data source: 98Carter 3625-3627)
> Ms. Carter showed Sally's earlier writing and told her: "This is the first day in school, and you wrote this in June. Now, look at this (beginning of school) you even have capital at the middle of the word. You don't do that anymore, do you?"

I asked Ms. Carter about her opinion on student self-assessments once: "Do you think the kids have the idea- I mean the criteria of each level, and which level they are at, and what the things they need to do so they can qualify for a specific level? Do you think that it would be too complicated for them to comprehend?" Ms. Carter replied: "Oh, yes. I mean how would I tell them. I encourage them to comment on each other's work. I gave them- I model the way that they can compliment each other" (Data source: 98Carter 1310 – 1314).

Ms. Carter had a writing portfolio for each student. Ms. Carter used everyday writing samples to assess student writing. Before the June (1998) report card was due, Ms. Carter told me, "I keep work (note: writing samples) all year. In fact, that's what I have been sorting in the last two to three days. I spent four hours on Sunday--just sorting papers (laughing)" (Data source: 98Carter: 4001-4002). I observed Ms. Carter examine student writing samples (one for each month) when she filled out the report card. On the

other hand, what Ms. Carter did was a basic form of portfolio assessment. Students were not involved in the process of work selection or evaluation of their own work.

Communication

I did not observe Ms. Carter engage in discussion with colleagues on assessment issues. Ms. Carter sometimes did discover inconsistency between her own judgment and the information on the report card (marked by the previous year's teacher), but she did not go to the kindergarten teacher to discuss the inconsistency or to ask about the assessment context as the District expected.

At the beginning of the 1997-98 school year, Ms. Carter told me that she would rather NOT go over the report cards filled out by kindergarten teachers in the previous year—she preferred to conduct the assessment by herself. Eventually, Ms. Carter did review the previous year's report cards and found some inconsistency. Yet, Ms. Carter believed that inconsistency was infrequent (data source: 97Carter 125-128) and she usually used the information to double-check her own evaluation when she received a new group of students.

Later, in a personal communication (December 3, 1999), Ms. Carter added that she usually had some discussion about inconsistent assessment results with new staff. However, her discussion with colleagues usually "ended with teachers' saying that the children probably forgot over the summer."

It should be pointed that, first, Ms. Carter collected assessment data from multiple sources and her conclusion was usually "grounded in an observation or a piece of work" as reported by one teacher in Falk (1998, p. 157). More significantly, Ms. Carter

grounded her evidence in contexts. That is, evidence of student reading/writing attitudes and/or work samples was evaluated under the consideration of the classroom/assessment activity that a student was engaged during a specific period of time. Ms. Carter did not seem to just spot check discrete skills out of contexts, but took a longitudinal approach to develop a complete view of student learning.

Second, as mentioned before, the present assessment program is "loosely prescribed" (Khattri et al., 1998) just like most other lower-grade performance assessment programs (e.g., the Early Literacy Portfolio (Salinger, 1998)), which seemed to allow Ms. Carter to conducted interview assessments in such a fashion that matched her personality. That is, since Ms. Carter values her individual time with students (learner-centered), her interviews appeared to be extensive, remedial, and learner-friendly. Dorfman (1997) suggests that teacher support was one of the factors that make the information obtained from a performance assessment become informatively useful. I wonder whether the fact that Ms. Carter was able to reveal her personality in her assessment practices would facilitate her ownership of and trust to the information obtained from the assessment program.

Information Gained from Rubrics

Ms. Carter said that she liked the reading/writing rubrics being laid out as continua so that she could identify student proficiency across levels and gather information about student progress on all assessment outcomes over time. In general, Ms. Carter believed that the rubrics that she used were more thorough than the ones used in other districts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The data below illustrated how Ms. Carter used the rubrics to grade and gather information about writing. Ms. Carter reviewed the rubric at the Expanding level, and pointed out the outcomes that Hollie had/not accomplished. Ms. Carter took Hollie's automaticity into consideration, reviewed the outcomes at the Expanding level again, and reflected on Hollie's writing in the classroom. Then Ms. Carter came to a conclusion and re-confirmed her grading. (A complete profile of Hollie's report card and reading and writing rubrics marked by Ms. Carter are illustrated in Appendix G.)

It should be noted that during this process, Ms. Carter did not just evaluate the *product* of the student's writing but the *attitude* of the student when she wrote. Ms. Carter did not just evaluate the specific writing sample but the student's writing in general. These considerations were not mandatory but were implied in the rubric.

> (Data source: 98Carter 1368-1502)
> I asked Ms. Carter how she would grade Hollie's writing.
> Ms. Carter replied: "She is into the Expanding, as far as the sequence of her writing is concerned. She has a beginning, middle, and end (note: #3 of Expanding of Report Card on writing). Let me go to another sheet (Note: Writing Development Continuum (writing rubric))."
> Ms. Carter: "She writes fluently: spelling and mechanics do not interfere with the flow of transferring thoughts to paper (#3 of Expanding Process). I put two to three of the convention (#6 of Expanding Process), although she does that only when I ask her to. She won't do that on her own. She does not like to revise (#8 of Expanding). And I haven't got into personal and imaginative stories yet (#1 of Product at Expanding)."
> Ashley: "OK."
> Ms. Carter: "Also, she doesn't think of the audience when she writes (#2 of Process at Expanding)."
> "What's that?"
> Ms. Carter: "There is none of the thinking about audience before she writes. I don't think she does that."
> "How do you know?"
> Ms. Carter: "Well, because she would change based on the comments I made about her work--everything I wrote for her. Right now she doesn't do that. So, she does the pre-writing (#1 of Expanding) and she can tell me what she planned to write about. I don't think I'll put her on the Expanding. There is something that I have for her in Expanding. Also, the revision on the computer (#8 of

> Process at Expanding)--she typed very slowly but she is not there yet. And she'll be master in writing. I can even mark the third one. Oh, also 'listens to peers' writing with positive comments and requests for additional information' (#4 of Expanding)."

Ms. Carter followed a similar procedure when she assessed reading. Ms. Carter seemed to use her own professional standards (for the grade level) to do a preliminary evaluation first, and then used the rubric to double check each skill to decide the student's reading proficiency level.

Specifically, in a reading assessment with Chrystal for the November (1997) report card, Ms. Carter used concise language to tell me about the student's performance, and to document what she observed in the reading log. Ms. Carter wrote 'picture cues' and 'one-to-one correspondence' in the reading log. Ms. Carter emphasized that Chrystal did not have the fluency that she would like to see, so she could not place her at the grade level "Beginning". Ms. Carter then pointed to the items at the Developing (one level above the grade standard) and Beginning levels of the rubric and stated whether the student's performance satisfied the items at each level. Based on the level with a majority of items checked, Ms. Carter then decided the reading proficiency level of the student.

> (Data source: 97Carter 2128-2188) 11/11/97
> After Chrystal's reading, Ms. Carter told me, "She does have one-to-one correspondence but she read slowly. She uses her fingers and she uses picture cues. She does follow some of the word pattern from the rhyming words. She was able to retell the story. These are some of the things I wrote down." Ms. Carter showed me her notes in the reading log-- "picture cues, one-to-one correspondence"
> Ms. Carter continued, "For reading, I probably still keep her here (note: the "Developing" level) because she hasn't had fluency yet. Her reading should demonstrate short vowels, primary short vowels, but she doesn't have the fluency that I would like her to have yet. She needs to be reading more challenging books in order to get her the Beginning reading."

> Ms. Carter pointed to the items listed in Developing of the rubric and continued to tell me, "She can choose a book independently (note: #2 of Attitude). She knows most of the letter sounds (note: #5 of Word Identification). She can identify upper and lower case letters (note: #4 of Word Identification). She knows a lot of sight words (note: #3 of Word Identification), can read the book that has word patterns (note: #1 of Word Identification), and she does rely on the print (note: #2 of Comprehension). She doesn't rely on the picture itself (Note: #2 of Comprehension). She's comfortably here."
>
> Pointing at the items in Beginning of the report card, Ms. Carter told me, "She's beginning to self-correct (note: #2 of Comprehension), and she can retell but we haven't even got in all the problems and characters (note: #3 of Comprehension). So again, I'll just keep her in Developing."

In the end-of-project interview, Ms. Carter told me that the assessment provided a good record of each student's progress over time. Ms. Carter said, "The progress is even more noticeable when I have a child who is not reading, who does not know letter sounds, and who cannot do math tasks at the beginning of the year. I told my students: 'If you look at the beginning of the year where you were and where you are now, aren't you proud of yourself? Look at how much you've done!" (Data source: 98Carter 3915 – 3931)

It appeared that Ms. Carter recognized the significance of the reading rubric and used it as a sound guideline to assess and gather information about student reading on a regular basis. In the data below, Ms. Carter told parent helpers to use the reading rubrics to evaluate student reading. The same rubric provided a consistent standard of evaluation so that student growth could be documented across evaluators.

> (Data source: 97Carter 2749-2760)
> Sally's mother was the helper of that day. Ms. Carter gave Sally's mother the "Reading Development Continuum" (note: the rubric) and told her, "You can check if you observe any of these listed." Ms. Carter also gave Sally's mother the folder of "Reading Log" to document her evaluation. The columns of the Reading Log were: "Date," "Name of Book or Story," "Finish? Yes-No," and "Comments".

> Ms. Carter saw that Vincent had finished his seatwork and was doing puzzles.
> Ms. Carter told Sally's mother that Vincent was a good candidate to pull out for reading.
> Vincent read "Frog and Toad Together" (by Arnold Lobel). Sally's mother listened attentively and asked Vincent: "Can you tell me what happened?" at the end.

To summarize, Ms. Carter trusted the reading and writing rubrics and used them carefully on a regular basis when she assessed for the report card and when she listened to students read. Ms. Carter did not appear to use the rubrics mechanically when she evaluated student performance on reading and writing. Ms. Carter drew upon her own personal judgment first and then used the rubrics to support and refine her own evaluation.

It should be noted that the reading/writing rubrics appeared to work as confirmation of Ms. Carter's hunches and provided evidence about student learning as was reported by most teachers in Jones and Chittenden (in press) and Salinger (1995; 1998). It appeared that the whole evaluative processes took a great deal of Ms. Carter's repeated deliberation between student performance and outcome items as well as her professional judgment across proficiency levels (Mehrens, 1992), which Gipps (1994) believes would cause teacher professional development.

More significantly, it seemed that assigning a proficiency level was not the main purpose of Ms. Carter, although she usually referred to a proficiency level initially when she checked the learning outcomes listed in the rubrics. Ms. Carter appeared to spend time examining closely whether students demonstrated specific skills and attitudes. Ms. Carter eventually decided whether individual students were comfortable at a specific level she assigned to self evaluate her own overall judgment. Labeling students was not Ms. Carter's purpose. This conclusion was supported by the finding of Dorfman (1997),

who reports that teachers who used the Work Sampling System paid more attention to student achievement and less on ranking students.

Use of Information/Assessment Results

Ms. Carter mainly used the assessment results to adjust her interaction with individual students, which included enrichment programs, encouragement, remedial teaching, and reading assignments at home. Data also indicated that Ms. Carter used the information gained from the assessment to make pedagogical decisions, for example, grouping. However, Ms. Carter was concerned about a political use of the assessment results against non-tenured teachers.

Specifically, based on the assessment results, Ms. Carter invited outside experts to provide enrichment programs for gifted students. Eventually, based on the information obtained from the assessment, Ms. Carter hoped to discover the activity that each student could do. Ms. Carter's response was surprising because I always assume that this assessment program was mainly to benefit struggling students (e.g., to close the achievement gap).

> (Data source: 98Carter 4029 – 4033)
> "If I have some students who finished the assessment, I'll see if I can get enrichment for them. I had the enrichment coordinator come in a couple of times and I pointed out Nils and Neil specifically, who are very gifted. I just want to find some activities for them to do. In reading, Hollie is reading junior grade books. Because she's reading at such a high level, I just got to find something that each kid could use. Sometimes they work and sometimes they don't. But the assessment helps."

Data also suggested that Ms. Carter used the information (the progress that the student made over time) that she obtained from the reading assessment to provide

feedback to the student. Ms. Carter encouraged the student for further learning on reading.

> (Data source: 98Carter 3865-3867)
> At the end of Scarlett's reading, Ms. Carter asked Scarlett: "Yeah. OK. Do you like this story?"
> "Yeah."
> Ms. Carter: "Yeah?"
> "I wish I could read this to my parents cause they like . . . "
> Ms. Carter: "If I get a chance in the lunch time, I'll Xerox. OK? Then you can take a copy home.
> You've come a long way. You're reading The New Hat and The Happy Egg. There is only one or two words on a page when you first started reading. Look at look at how well you're coming! How far you have come! In one year! Aren't you proud of yourself?"
> "Yeah."
> Ms. Carter: "You're doing great job, Scarlett."

It seemed that the information obtained from the interview assessment was immediately used for remedial teaching even during the assessment. For example, as soon as Ms. Carter found out that her student, Roy, was way off the target (incompetent in reading his own writing), Ms. Carter took the one-on-one opportunity to conduct remedial assistance. Ms. Carter guided and prompted Roy to read his own writing step by step. She encouraged Roy to respond. Ms. Carter explained the writing context to Roy. Ms. Carter also inquired about Roy's reading situation at home. Ms. Carter asked Roy which way he preferred to be helped in class. It should be noted that the District recommended teachers do remedial reinforcement during the interview assessments. Yet, the scope and depth of the remedial assistance was not mandated.

> (Data source: 97Carter 1388-1528)
> Ms. Carter gave the journal that Roy wrote that morning and asked, "Can you read the story for me?"
> "[I don't remember] anything."
> Ms. Carter: "Tell me what you remember."
> "I don't remember."

Ms. Carter: "Read this, honey. Read what you can. OK?"
Roy still could not read his own writing.
Pointing at Roy's writing, Ms. Carter asked, "What does g say?"
"[ja]"
Ms. Carter: "G [ga]"
"Oh, right, G says [ga]"
Ms. Carter read Roy's writing "Go to- that's a big city-"
"I don't know. I haven't gone there."
Ms. Carter: "No. But I do. This is when you are going to tell me what you are going to be."
Ms. Carter read Roy's writing again, "When I go to-"
"Washington D.C."
Ms. Carter read and asked: "I- will- I will what?"
"I don't know about Washington."
Ms. Carter interrupted him, "I will meet the- What do you want to do when you go to the White House?"
"Hm- the President."
Ms. Carter: "The President. Is that what this said?"
"Uhm."

Ms. Carter: "OK. I think you did a pretty good job. You need to practice and put more space between your words. OK? Did you read anything at home?
"I read at home."
Ms. Carter: "You did? What did you read at home?"
"Mostly library books."
Ms. Carter: "OK. But did you read it every day?"
"No"
Ms. Carter: "Did you take it out and read it by yourself?"
"What?"
Ms. Carter: "Are you reading at home?"
" . . "
Ms. Carter: "Hm- Like what?"
"Like um . ."
Ms. Carter: "I have that book. Do you think you can read it in school during free choice?"
" . . . I don't know any adult . . . "
Ms. Carter: Next time when you have a free choice, you and I can read together. In fact, when you need some help, do you know who else can help you, if you want?"
"Yeah."
Ms. Carter: "Neil and Hollie are pretty good readers. Would you want one of them to help you?"
"No."
Ms. Carter: "No. You would rather Miss Whitger?"
"Hm."
Ms. Carter: "OK. How about Sally's mom? She comes and helps me sometimes."

"Oh, yeah."
Ms. Carter: "Is that OK?"
Roy nodded.
Ms. Carter: "OK. Next time, you can't read a book, we'll have one of the adults help you. But I think you can do it. You have come a long way!"

Based on the information obtained from the assessment, Ms. Carter also assigned reading material at home. For example, during the interview assessment, Ms. Carter noticed that the student needed serious help on sounding-out words, so she gave the book to the student to take home to practice.

(Data source: 98Carter 2046 – 2106)
Ms. Carter gave Marius a book and told him: " . . . This is called 'Up Up Up in the Way. The first word is LOOK."
"Look at (5 seconds) that." (note: should be 'this')
Ms. Carter: "Good, but it has an S at the end."
"That?"
Ms. Carter: "[i]"
"[i]"
Ms. Carter: "What's the word?"
"Look at this."
Ms. Carter: "Good. 'Look at this."

"What (4 seconds) um- "
Ms. Carter: "Sound it out."
(18 seconds) Ms. Carter: "Sound it out."
"[u n]"
Ms. Carter: "Sound it out again . . ."
"[u n]"
Ms. Carter: "OK."
"[u n]"
Ms. Carter: "Now put the beginning one together with the UN. (4 seconds)"
"[u n]"
Ms. Carter: "Now hold that middle one longer, [u-]"
"[u- n]"
Ms. Carter: "Then how do you put them together?"
"Fun."
Ms. Carter: "Hm. What?"
"Fun."
Ms. Carter: "Oh."
"What fun (rising tone). We will go up in it. We will go (5 seconds) m- ago."

Ms. Carter: "Sound it out. You have already read it in the sentence. (10 seconds) [a]"
"[a-] away."
Ms. Carter: "Hm."
"Away."
Ms. Carter: "You didn't know you could read these words? I'd like you to take this home and practice."
"OK."

Ms. Carter used the information obtained from the interview assessment for pedagogical decisions. Immediately after listening to Brad's (a beginning reader) reading, Ms. Carter told me: "OK. Brad, I might have to put him with Marius. Marius has very low self-esteem. I will give him any opportunity to do something" (data source: 98Carter 2318). Ms. Carter had a similar arrangement for another student Sam who only mouth read. Ms. Carter decided to place Sam in a smaller reading group with only three students in the group (data source: 97Carter 701-702).

Nonetheless, Ms. Carter felt that the information obtained from the assessment program was so specific that it might put non-tenured teachers in a vulnerable situation. Ms. Carter and some other teachers (according to Ms. Carter) were worried that when students did not perform as well as the District expected (as shown in the marked rubrics), the District might use it against teachers (98Carter 3908-3913).

(Data source: 98Carter 3908 – 3913)
Ms. Carter: "They want to know specifically which objectives the children have reached and when they reach them."
I asked: "So you sent the continuum to-"
Ms. Carter: "That goes to the Research Department, and they keep tracks of all the children AND all the teachers. I also have a problem with that, because I think at some point any administrator can use that information against teachers."
I asked: "Are they using that?"
Ms. Carter: "They say they are not, but I think with different kind of administration it could be used against non-tenured teachers, if they thought they want to know if the children are learning as much as the District wanted them to.

> That's a personal opinion. Actually, it's not personal. I heard from other people too. But, It's totally denied."
> (Note: Once, with my presence, Ms. Carter asked the Principal if the assessment results would be used against teachers. The Principal said, "No, unless there was a pattern showing the students of specific teachers did not reach goals, like 3 to 5 years in a row.")

In summary, although Ms. Carter was afraid that the marked rubrics might be used against teachers, Ms. Carter used the information obtained from the assessments in a variety of ways. Ms. Carter invited outside experts to develop an enrichment program for gifted students, as well as assigned reading material and changed grouping for struggling readers. Most of the time, Ms. Carter used the information obtained from the interview even before the assessment was finished. Ms. Carter conducted on-site remedial teaching, shared progress with students, and encouraged students.

It should be noted that Ms. Carter's concern that District administrators might use assessment results against teachers was theoretically valid. Salinger (1998) reports that the "Emergent Literacy Scale" was officially used for accountability purposes in the Early Literacy Portfolio program. As described earlier, Early Literacy Portfolio used "Emergent Literacy Scale" to grade and summarize each student's literacy growth. There are six points in the Scale, which describes six stages of district standards on literacy development. The six stages are: Early Emergent (1 point), Advanced Emergent (2 points), Early Beginning Reading (3 points), Advanced Beginning Reader (4 points), Early Independent Reader (5 points), and Advanced Independent Reader (6 points) (Salinger, 1998).

The reading/writing rubrics in the present study have a similar design. There are five proficiency levels: Pre-Emergent (target for pre-kindergarten), Emergent (target for kindergarten), Developing (target for pre-first grade), Beginning (target for first-grade),

and Expanding (target for second-grade). Each *level* can be easily assigned with a point value. In addition, it is certainly workable that the District assigns a number to each outcome *item* (under each proficiency level) in the rubrics and keeps track of student performance on all items.

Currently, the District does save reading/writing rubrics marked by classroom teachers on computer. Nonetheless, as mentioned above, by far the District did not seem to use the information obtained to hold teachers or schools accountable.

Ms. Ford

Profile

Ms. Ford is a first-grade teacher. Ms. Ford holds a continuing certificate with a state university. Ms. Ford is eligible to teach K-8 all subjects, K-9 math, and K-12 gym (data source: 98Carter 4064-4074). Ms. Ford has been teaching for 13 years and has taught 9 years in "Washington" School.

Ms. Ford started her career teaching the seventh and eighth grades. Ms. Ford taught math (pre-algebra and algebra), English composition and grammar, and religion. Ms. Ford came to work as a helper at "Lincoln" Elementary School. Ms. Ford helped out in kindergarten, first, second, and third grade classrooms. Ms. Ford usually worked with students who were experiencing difficulty in a certain area.

Ms. Ford then came to "Washington" School and was an assistant in the ESL room. When the teacher went on a sabbatical, Ms. Ford took over and ran the program for one semester. When the ESL teacher returned, Ms. Ford was placed in the first grade classroom. The 1997-98 school year was Ms. Ford's ninth year teaching first grade.

Ms. Ford's class is well organized and efficient. According to Ms. Ford's student teacher, Ms. Ford usually planned for the whole week and copied all the worksheets she needed (data source: 97Ford 601-602). Ms. Ford liked to keep her students busy at all times (data source 97Ford 469). According to the student teacher, the pace in Ms. Ford's class was much faster than the 2-3 other classrooms that the student teacher had seen in other schools (data source 97Ford 598).

Assessment Practices

Integration

Generally speaking, Ms. Ford collected assessment data on reading four times a year mainly through one-on-one reading. In an interview in June 1998, Ms. Ford said,

> (Data source: 98Carter 4145-4146)
> "Usually I collect data at the beginning of the year as they come in and before the first report card which is in November, before the second report card which is in March, and before the last report card, which is in June. The month preceding the report card, I'll work very hard on those skills so that I can assess to see where they are at."

According to my classroom observation, Ms. Ford was talking about reinforcing mathematics skills, when she said, "I'll work very hard on those skills so that I can assess to see where they are at" (see above, data source: 98Carter 4145-4146). Yet, Ms. Ford explained in a personal communication on December 3, 1999, that she also reinforced reading skills in workbooks and writing skills in everyday story summary writing.

Ms. Ford tried collecting data for reading assessment during classroom activities. In October 1997, one month before the November report cards were due, Ms. Ford told

her student teacher to ask each student in her advanced reading group to read one page, so that Ms. Ford could assess student reading (data source: 97Ford 772).

I did observe Ms. Ford collect writing assessment data on certain days specifically for the report card. On November 5, two weeks before the report cards were due, Ms. Ford arranged the morning writing routine in a way that she could collect writing samples and assess writing proficiency. On this day, while the students were writing about the story the student teacher had just read, Ms. Ford told the class that she did not want to give them a lot of worksheets that morning. Ms. Ford said that she wanted them to spend more time on writing the story that they had just heard. There were only three worksheets that morning (note: there were usually five or six worksheets on other days): Color/Camouflage, Clown math, and "br/bl" words (data source: 97Ford 1754-1758 and 1697). Ms. Ford encouraged students to brainstorm before they wrote about the story (data source: 97Ford 1722-1723). Ms. Ford then called up students based on the schedule of parent-teacher conferences. Ms. Ford dated the writing first and checked the capitalization and punctuation (data source: 97Ford 1785-1788; 1854-1856; 1938-1940; 1975-1977). Ms. Ford and her student teacher collected and corrected every student's writing everyday, so the above procedure was not new to the students.

It is hard to say that Ms. Ford integrated the assessment program into her regular classroom teaching because Ms. Ford pulled out students to read to her four times a year and assessed students' writing three times a year. On the other hand, Ms. Ford checked student writing (stories and worksheets) carefully every day and she observed and reflected on student participation during the reading group, and most importantly, Ms. Ford used these data as sources when she marked the rubrics and report cards. In this

regard, Ms. Ford did integrate observation into her classroom teaching. In fact, in a personal communication (December 3, 1999) with me, Ms. Ford indicated that she integrated assessments into the curriculum. Ms. Ford said, "Teachers cannot get all the information from one-on-one conferences and should look at the whole picture," and "Teachers could not evaluate student learning without integrating assessments in the classroom."

Data Sources

Ms. Ford used student writing samples dated one week before the report cards were due as major sources for the report cards. Ms. Ford explained to me, "It is a must to use writing samples close to the date of the report card because students are learning and changing each day in first grade" (personal communication, December 3, 1999). Specifically, Ms. Ford used student writing on November 5 and 12 for the November report card, depending on when Ms. Ford would meet the parents. The parent-teacher conferences were scheduled on November 13, 18, and 20 (data source: 97Ford 1682-1693).

Ms. Ford also drew upon her evaluation of student everyday writing when she filled up the report card. For example, while checking capitalization and punctuation, Ms. Ford usually reflected on student attitudes towards writing in class. Ms. Ford said, "Lisa needs help. She could not do it on her own" (data source: 97Ford 2034-2038). Ms. Ford also recalled that Oliver did not usually finish copying from the board (data source: 97Ford 2297-2299).

Sometimes Ms. Ford could recall student writing performance without checking the student's writing because Ms. Ford and/or her student teacher checked student writing

and worksheets and provided individual help for corrections almost everyday. On November 12, 1997, Ms. Ford at first told me that she needed Kristin's present writing sample to grade her writing. Then, Ms. Ford told me that she could grade Kristin's writing against the writing rubric without looking at Kristin's writing, "Because I can remember her writing." Ms. Ford recalled, "She can write noun-verb phrases (#1 Outcome of writing product at the Developing level). Takes risks with writing (#1 Outcome of writing attitude at the Developing level)--She's starting to take risks, which I see as working on tasks on their own without so much assistance. She started considering that she can do it" (data source: 2492-2499). Generally speaking, Ms. Ford did not document her observation of student writing, but she constantly thought about the specific student that she was grading when she filled out the report cards.

Ms. Ford's data source for reading assessments was mainly collected from reading groups. On November 5, 1997, Ms. Ford told me that she could not grade Hillary's reading because Hillary went to the next room for reading and she needed to check with that teacher (97Ford 1954-1956). Sometimes Ms. Ford still graded a student's reading and then double checked with the student teacher who led the reading group that the student was in (data source: 2040-2043).

Before the report card was due, Ms. Ford also listened to each student read to her individually. On November 5, 1997, Ms. Ford told me that she would listen to the students read the next week (data source: 97Ford 2106-2107).

In summary, when assessing writing, Ms. Ford examined student writing on a specific day as a direct data source. Ms. Ford also examined her memory of student everyday writing samples and student writing processes and attitudes. Ms. Ford used

student performance in the reading group as a major source for the reading assessments. Ms. Ford collected this information from another teacher and the student teacher who led the group. Ms. Ford said that she did not need to listen to individual students read but she still did. Ms. Ford seemed to use the individual reading to verify the information that she collected from the reading group.

Assessment Methods

According to Ms. Ford, she assessed student reading mainly through her observation when she led the reading groups. Ms. Ford paid attention to student participation. Ms. Ford said that she usually called up all children, and based on each student's participation, she could tell his/her reading proficiency (data source: 97Ford 1640-1643, 1495-1497, and 98Carter 4157). Ms. Ford recalled that she filled out the report card according to what she had observed in class (data source: 98Carter 4095-4097).

Ms. Ford seemed to spend most of her non-teaching time on checking student writing, worksheets, or workbooks and helping individual students on their corrections, which Ms. Ford believed would inform her about the student reading and writing (data source: 97Ford 1496). I remember when Ms. Ford was teaching, her student teacher was grading assignments, and when her student teacher was teaching, Ms. Ford was grading assignments (data source: 97Ford 163-164).

To conclude, Ms. Ford believed that she did a thorough job on assessing reading (data source: 98Carter 4151-4157). Ms. Ford observed how her students were doing and always kept in mind what she saw in the class—"I think about them during the class. I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

think about them answering questions. I always think about the things that had occurred in the classroom." Ms. Ford told me, "That gave me a good feeling for how they were doing." Ms. Ford believed that she was accurate on assessing student reading proficiency" (98Carter 4162-4168).

Ms. Ford also conducted one-on-one/pullout reading assessments. Yet, in general, Ms. Ford did not think that pulling out individual students to read to her was always necessary. Ms. Ford trusted her own observation during the reading group. In the end-of-project interview, Ms. Ford told me:

> (Data source: 98Ford 4080-4082)
> "The assessment-- sometimes I think is good but I don't really feel it is necessary to have the one-on-one conference with the kids. By observing them in class, I can tell whether they can pass the assessment." I asked, "How do you do it?" Ms. Ford: "Just by their reaction in class and the questions you ask them. You can usually tell if the kids are really catching on to the concept without doing a one-on-one conference."

Ms. Ford compared the present assessment program with the one that she used two years ago, which was mainly based on teachers' classroom observation-- "I'll fill out [the report card] according to how I have observed in class" (data source: 98Carter 4092-4097). Ms. Ford concluded as follows:

> "I feel that the assessment (note: one-on-one conference/interview) does give you a lot of information but I can't say that I wouldn't have known that. A few times students' reactions through the assessment (note: one-on-one conference/interview) surprised me but, on the whole, I feel that three-quarters of the class I could have assessed without giving a one-on-one conference. I check their work carefully and work individually with them. Throughout the year I have a very good feel for what they can do. I would say yes I have learned information about my students through the assessment (note: one-on-one conference/interview) but there are other ways to learn information about students other than assessing them" (data source: 98Carter 4099 and 4106-4111).

Ms. Ford said that one-on-one conferences or interview assessments were too time-consuming and substitute teachers usually could not control the class ("because the kids will want you over the substitute"). Ms. Ford felt that she had the responsibility to be in class and to provide quality teaching. Ms. Ford told me:

> "The worst thing about the assessment (note: interviews) is that it is very time consuming. When I have to get a substitute to assess children, my class falls apart. The kids suffer when I'm not in the classroom. It's not a good learning situation. I don't feel relaxed during the assessment when I can hear the noise in the classroom. It's hard for me to relax and to do the one-on-one conference knowing that the class is just falling apart" (data source: 98Carter 4101-4104).

Ms. Ford said she then tried to assess in the classroom during a "quiet time" (e.g., October and November 1997 for the November report card). Ms. Ford still ran into problems because there were so many interruptions in the classroom—"At this level, [they were] very needy. The kids need to tell you things." Ms. Ford felt the best arrangement was to have a student teacher teach the class and she could "pull students back to work with" her (data source: 98Carter 4181-4191).

Ms. Ford's belief that (1) interview assessments on reading were not essential and she could obtain almost the same information from her classroom observation, and (2) there were serious drawbacks related to the interview assessment, seemed to affect her procedure of conducting the interview/pullout assessments. Ms. Ford seemed to use the interview assessment to double-check her day-to-day evaluation of her students' learning. My opinion is based on the following observation:

> (Data source: 98Ford 2264-2291)
> Kristin read slowly word by word.
>
> > "The road went up a steep hill. Grasshopper climbed to the top. He found a big apple lying on the ground. 'I will have my lunch,' said Grasshopper. He ate a big bite of the apple. 'Look what you did,' said a worm, who lived in the apple. 'You have made a hole in my roof' (end of page). 'It is not nice to eat a person's house,' said the worm. 'I am sorry,' said

> Grasshopper. Just then the apple began to roll down the road. 'Stop me! Catch me,' cried the worm. The apple was rolling faster and faster (end of page)."
>
> Ms. Ford told Kristin that it was all she needed to read. Kristin told Ms. Ford that she had not finished the story yet (Note: her voice was then much louder than when she was reading the text). Ms. Ford told her: "You don't have to read the whole story. I just want to have an idea of the kind of story that you can read. Will you send out Sonia?"

There were several features revealed in Ms. Ford's interview assessments. First, Ms. Ford chose only the books that students had not read before (as the districted recommended to ensure the trustworthiness of the assessment results). Ms. Ford explained to me, "You are supposed to give them a book that they haven't read before; because if they read it before, they might have memorized it" (data source: 98Ford 2508-2511).

Second, the flexibility of the assessment program allowed Ms. Ford to switch books as soon as she found that the book was too hard or too easy for the student. For example, Oliver could not read the first three words of the story ("Father said come"), so Ms. Ford gave Oliver another book to read (data source: 97Ford 2153-2268 and 2278-2295).

> (Data source: 97Ford 2153-2185)
> Ms. Ford told Oliver: "See if you can read this to me--'The Birthday Car."
> Oliver did not read.
> Ms. Ford read: "Fa-ther."
> "Father"
> Oliver repeated what Ms. Ford said but could not continue.
> Ms. Ford: "Come."
> "Come."
> Ms. Ford: "Here."
> "Here."
> Ms. Ford: "Are these words hard for you, honey?"
> "Yeah."
> Ms. Ford: "OK. Let's choose a different book then."

Third, Ms. Ford prompted when students experienced difficulty but could still collect information about student reading proficiency. For example, in the data below, Ms. Ford encouraged the student to sound out and to self-correct, and Ms. Ford also provided phonetic rules to help the student read. Oliver could not read "How pretty," "something white," "Look where," and "find" in the second book.

(Data source: 97Ford 2187-2263)
Ms. Ford picked up another book, "Run to the Rainbow," and turned to the first page for Oliver.
Ms. Ford: "This is 'Run to the Rainbow,' OK?"
Oliver did not start so Ms. Ford prompted.
Ms. Ford: "Oh."
"Oh. Look (4 seconds) Loo-k at . . . "
Ms. Ford: "At."
"At [Thee Thee Thee]"
Ms. Ford: "Was."
"Was. I see a"
Ms. Ford: "look."
"Look . . ."

Ms. Ford turned to the next page.
Oliver read, "Look up up up. Look way up. (3 seconds)"
Ms. Ford: "How."
"How how"
Ms. Ford: "Pretty."
"Pretty it is."
Ms. Ford: "Good. How pretty it is."
Ms. Ford turned the page.

"I"
Ms. Ford: "Right here."
"I see (7 seconds)."
Ms. Ford: "What's this word?"
"I don't know. (7 seconds)"
Ms. Ford: "Some-"
"Some"
Ms. Ford: "Thing."
"Thing."
Ms. Ford: "Something."
"Something."

Oliver could not continue.
Ms. Ford: "Sound it out."
"[r e] red. I see the red. I see the I see"
Ms. Ford: "[ai]."

"I see the" (very soft)
Ms. Ford: "Sound of the magic E word. The i says its name. [whu]"
"[whu]"
Ms. Ford: "[ai]"
"[ai]"
Ms. Ford: "[t]"
"[t]"
Ms. Ford: "White."
"White. White [u:- k] [u:- k u-]"
Ms. Ford: "Look."
"Look [whu e-]"
Ms. Ford: "Where."
"Where it goes. We can go to. We can [an]"
Ms. Ford: "find."
"Find out where it goes. We can . . . and find it."
Ms. Ford: "Good girl, very good. You may join the group. OK. Thank you."

Nonetheless, after listening to Oliver read, Ms. Ford still could review the reading rubric and checked the skills that were illustrated in the student's reading. They were: using picture cues, tracking words, recognizing upper and lower cases, and choosing books to read (except having enough sight language). This outcome is significant because even with a beginning reader, the teacher still could document the reading skills that the student used.

(Data source: 97Ford 2278-2295)
After Oliver left, Ms. Ford evaluated Oliver's reading.
Ms. Ford marked on the Reading Development Continuum (rubric) as follows:
Ms. Ford checked the two items in Comprehension under "Developing"
#1- Makes predictions based on pictures and title
#2- RElies on print and illustrations to construct meaning (1.7)

Ms. Ford also checked item #1, 2, and 4 of Word Identification under "Developing"
#1- 'Reads books with word patterns'.
#2- 'Tracks words: has one-to-one correspondence'.

#4- 'Identifies upper and lower case letters (1.5)'

Ms. Ford did not check #3 of Word Identification under "Developing:"
'Begins to build a sight word vocabulary to draw upon, with automatically, when reading'.
Ms. Ford told me, "Her sight vocabulary is not so good.

Ms. Ford checked Item #2 of Attitude under "Developing"
#2- 'Independently chooses books s/he look at (1.1)'.
Ms. Ford said, "She's choosing books to read.

Fourth, there were some differences on interview assessments between November 1997 and June1998 report cards, as Ms. Ford gradually decreased her assistance and increased her evaluation on reading comprehension. For example, when assessing for the June 1998 report card, Ms. Ford seemed to prompt less often than she did for the November report card in 1997. Ms. Ford tended to correct the student when the student did not read the text correctly. Ms. Ford did not ask questions to check comprehension in the interview assessment for the 1997 report card, but Ms. Ford did for the 1998 report card. At the end of a student's reading, Ms. Ford usually asked a general question about the story, such as, "Can you tell me what you just read?" Ms. Ford then asked for factual information of the story (unless the student answered the general question very completely). Ms. Ford would ask questions such as, "What did they ask him to do?" "What didn't he want him to do along the way?" "When did he want the donkey to get here?" and "What did she say to nibble on?" Occasionally, Ms. Ford would ask a 'why' question.

Fifth, generally speaking, Ms. Ford asked students to read shorter texts (i.e., two to a couple pages) than the ones that Ms. Carter had her students read. Ms. Ford seemed

to worry that the substitute teacher could not handle the class and tried to finish the assessment as soon as possible.

Sixth, it seemed that Ms. Ford tended to seek a correct answer from a student instead of finding out the rationale of the student's response. The District expected teachers to examine student thinking processes, and teachers might fulfill this expectation by asking students how they came up with their answer. In the data below, Ms. Ford prompted for self-corrections and asked the same question ("Why did the Grasshopper eat that apple?") repeatedly until the student finally said the answer ("because he was hungry"). (In fact, I think, in the text, the Grasshopper said, "I will have my lunch." The Grasshopper did not say he was hungry.) The student might have changed her answer from "because the worm was inside it" to "because he was hungry" simply because the latter seemed to be a correct answer to Ms. Ford's question--"Why did the Grasshopper eat that apple?"

(Data source: 98Ford 2313-2439)
Ellen was a struggling reader.
Ms. Ford told Ellen, "Won't you read 'A New House'?"
Ellen read: "The [red] (note: 'road')"
Ms. Ford: "Read this for me."
"[red]"
Ms. Ford: "What? The O says its name if there's two vowels that come together."
"[ou]?"
Ms. Ford: "[r-oud]"
"[roud] went up a [sta sta] hill."
Ms. Ford: "Steep hill."
"Steep hill. Grasshopper climbed"

At the end of the reading, Ms. Ford turned to Ellen, "Why did the Grasshopper eat that apple?"
"There was a hole in it."
Ms. Ford: "Hu?"
"Because the worm was inside it."
Ms. Ford: "Cause what?"
"Because the worm was inside."

Ms. Ford: "Did the Grasshopper know the worm was inside?"
"No."
Ms. Ford: "No. Why did the Grasshopper eat the apple?"
"Um- because . . ."
Ms. Ford: "What?"
"Because the worm didn't want him to eat want him to eat the apple."
Ms. Ford: "But why did the Grasshopper take a bite of the apple?"
"Because the worm was inside it."
Ms. Ford: "Cause what?"
"The worm was inside."
Ms. Ford: "But he didn't know the worm was inside it until he took a bite. How come he took a bite?"
"Because he because he was hungry (rising tone)."
Ms. Ford: "Right, he was hungry. You can go back into the classroom."
Ellen left.

To conclude, Ms. Ford trusted her own in-class observation and working with students individually and did not think that interview assessments were essential to obtain information of student learning on reading and writing. Ms. Ford still conducted interviews to assess student reading and compared student performance against the rubric carefully, although her interview assessments were usually brief. According to Ms. Ford, the pullout interview assessments were time consuming and students of lower grades (K-2) were usually needy. Ms. Ford was under a great deal of stress in conducting interview assessments outside the classroom.

I do not have data to illustrate how Ms. Ford conducted student self-assessments. I suspect that Ms. Ford had a different understanding of "self-assessment." Ms. Ford probably thought that "self-assessment" was her own in-class evaluation of students. I have this impression based on what Ms. Ford told me in the end-of-project interview. Ms. Ford told me: "I did some self assessment when they come to reading." I asked Ms. Ford how she did it. Ms. Ford replied: "I observed them during the reading time. I did a very thorough job in reading. I called on all children whether they have their hands

raised or not and I listened to children read individually. This gave me a very good feel for how they are doing" (Data source: 98Carter 4151-4157).

Ms. Ford kept writing samples in each student's portfolio folder. Ms. Ford's students listened to a story every morning and then wrote a story about it. Ms. Ford and her student teacher checked student writing every day. Ms. Ford sent all writing samples home, and Ms. Ford seemed to have good memory of each student's writing proficiency. Before each report card was due, Ms. Ford usually assigned the writing of a specific day (one or two weeks before the due date) as a data source for the assessment.

For the June (1998) report card, Ms. Ford included some worksheets in the student's folder/portfolio to pass on to the second grade teacher. They were some pages from reading workbooks. Ms. Ford told the students that it was a test when they worked on the worksheets (data source: 98Ford 2224). The decision on what to include in portfolios was not made by Ms. Ford alone. Ms. Ford explained to me, "The content of the student's portfolio is agreed upon by the K-2 teaching staff every year" (personal communication, December 3, 1999).

Ms. Ford also kept the assessment information (e.g., Reading/Writing Development Continuum) that the kindergarten teacher passed on to her in each student's folder/portfolio. Ms. Ford usually marked on the Reading/Writing Development Continuum that a kindergarten teacher had already marked. Ms. Ford used different colored ink and wrote down the time of her assessment to distinguish her marking from the kindergarten teacher's. In this way, Ms. Ford could have an overview of student performance in the first grade and kindergarten.

Communication

There did not seem to be a great deal of conversation between Ms. Ford and other teachers. In fact, Ms. Ford wondered whether what she did on the assessments was similar to her colleagues. Ms. Ford once asked me: "Is this pretty much how everybody else assesses them?" (data source: 2444-2453)

Ms. Ford consulted her student teacher and the teacher next door about some students' participation in their reading group to assess these students' reading. For example, Ms. Ford told me that she had to check with the teacher next door because Hillary went to the next room for reading (Data source: 97Ford 1954-1955 and 2775-2781). Ms. Ford did not seem to discuss assessment results with her student teacher or the teacher next door.

Ms. Ford said that she would pass on the assessment rubric and each student's portfolio to the next year's teacher "so that they can see how much they learned in the first grade (data source: 98Carter 4150 and 4141-4143). Yet, Ms. Ford did not mention that she scheduled face-to-face meetings with second-grade teachers. Ms. Ford later explained to me that it was because of time constraints (personal communication, December 3, 1999). Ms. Ford also sent the marked rubrics to the District research office (data source: 98Carter 4170-4179) as the District required, but Ms. Ford did not seem to provide feedback to the District about her use of the assessment program.

Nonetheless, I noticed that Ms. Ford maintained good communication with parents. Ms. Ford had three evening conferences scheduled with the parents for the November (1997) report cards. They were: 11/13 (Thursday) 4-7:30 p.m., 11/18 (Tuesday) 4-7:30 p.m., and 11/20 (Thursday) 3:45-8:10 p.m. Ms. Ford met each parent

for 20 to 40 minutes (data source: 97Ford 1682-1693). Ms. Ford scheduled another round of parent-teacher conferences for the June (1998) report card.

The purpose of these conferences was for Ms. Ford to give and explain report cards to parents and to answer their questions. Ms. Ford believed that the conferences helped her explain the report cards to the parents. Thus, Ms. Ford said that she did not write excessively in the report card because the parents could understand the report cards very well (data source: 98Ford 1648).

To conclude, with reference to the literature reviewed in the first two chapters, two aspects of Ms. Ford's assessment practices were striking. First, Salinger (1998) reports that teachers (in Early Literacy Portfolio) accommodated time-demanding data collection practices and gradually integrated their assessments into classroom routines. Yet, my study of Ms. Ford's assessment practices suggests the necessity of serious reviews of student attainment before each report card. That is, while it is necessary for teachers to collect day-to-day data to obtain a big picture of student learning in contexts, teachers should also update their information for each report card, for example, through one-on-one conferences and special writing assignments, especially when their students are young children.

Second, there seems to be a potential threat that only superficial information will be obtained when one-on-one conferences or interviews are too brief (because of time pressure). In the "grasshopper" reading assessment, Ms. Ford seemed to focus on guiding the student to articulate a correct answer while the student's thinking process and problem-solving strategies were not assessed. In fact, some "promises" about performance assessments might mislead readers to believe that performance assessments

are to collect factual information. For example, Marzano (1995) believes that performance assessments provide information about the ability and skill level of individual students, which present "a faithful reflection of intended and important learning outcomes" (Gipps, 1994, p.101).

Information Gained from Rubrics

Ms. Ford adopted an inductive approach during the academic term when concluding student proficiency levels. Ms. Ford first checked assessment items and directly marked on the reading/writing rubric. Based on the marking of the rubric, Ms. Ford then decided the student's proficiency level on the report card. Ms. Ford later explained to me, "You should first do the rubric before doing the proficiency level on the report card. Otherwise, there is no sense in using the rubric" (personal communication, December 3, 1999). On the report card, Ms. Ford put the time (month or semester and the year) of the assessment in the column that represents the child's reading/writing proficiency level.

> (Data source: 97Ford 1975-2032)
> After listening to Tracy read, Ms. Ford marked #3 Emergent Comprehension and # Emergent Attitude on the reading rubric,. Ms. Ford also marked #2 Developing Comprehension, #2 Developing Word Identification, and #2 Developing Attitude. Ms. Ford said that she would place Tracy's reading at the Developing level on the report card.
>
> Ms. Ford corrected Tracy's writing and on the writing rubric, Ms. Ford marked #1 Developing Product, #3, #6, #8, and #9 Beginning Process, and #1 Beginning Product. Ms. Ford concluded: "So she is in the Beginning level."

Ms. Ford followed strict rules when deciding student proficiency levels. Specifically, unless a student fulfilled all the criteria of a specific proficiency level, Ms.

Ford would not place that student at the end of that level. "They have to be perfect," explained Ms. Ford (personal communication, December 3, 1999). If a student was proficient in only some of the items of a specific level, Ms. Ford would place him/her at the beginning or mid of that level (personal communication, December 3, 1999), *if* the items marked were significant ones at that level. Otherwise, Ms. Ford would place that student one level lower. In the data 97Ford 2045 – 2074, Ms. Ford did not grade the student's writing at the Developing level, although the students fulfilled three of the four Developing *Process* outcomes but none of the Developing *Product* or *Attitude* outcomes. Ms. Ford marked the following items: "Writing is from left-right, top-bottom" (#2 Developing Process), "Begins to use spacing between words" (#3 Developing Process), and "May interchange upper and lower case letters (#4 Developing Process). Ms. Ford did not mark "Begins to read own writing" (#1 of Developing Process), "Begins to write noun-verb phrases" (#1 of Developing Product), or "Takes risks with writing" (#1 of Attitude). Eventually, Ms. Ford graded the student at Emergent level, which was one level lower than the Developing level.

At the end of the school year, Ms. Ford sometimes decided proficiency levels before marking the rubric. In the data below, Ms. Ford marked the student's proficiency level on the report card directly without working on the rubric first. This may be because Ms. Ford was familiar with the assessment items/criteria and proficiency levels listed in the rubric.

> (Data source: 98Ford 1773-1776)
> After listening to Jesse read, Ms. Ford told me: "He'll be at the end of the Beginning section for reading." Ms. Ford put the date at the end of beginning section on the report card. Ellen came to ask a question. Ms. Ford told her: "Just a minute."

> Ms. Ford checked "Reads own writing several days later with consistency of meaning" and "Responds with positive comments to the content of another author's work" and "Forms letters legibly" on the Writing Development Continuum (rubric).
>
> Ms. Ford then told me: "OK. He'll be at the end of Beginning section for writing." I noticed almost all of the rest of items in the beginning section were checked.

The accumulation of marked rubrics seemed to help teachers trace student progress over time. This assertion is supported by Ms. Ford's comment: "I do use the continuum (note: rubric) to see what they could do in the kindergarten and to see what progress they made in the first grade. Then, I pass them on to the second grade teacher" (data source: 98Carter 4136). I noticed that all students came to the first grade with marked reading/writing rubrics in their own folder and all items marked were dated in different colors.

> (Data source: 97Ford 1820-1825 and 1851)
> Charles just turned in his writing, so Ms. Ford pulled out Charles's Writing and Reading Development Continuum (rubrics) from Charles's old folder and marked. Some items on the Reading Development Continuum (rubric) were marked: 11/96, 3/97, or 6/97 (by Charles's kindergarten teacher) in three different ink colors. Ms. Ford checked the items in the rubric that the kindergarten teacher did not mark.

To conclude, Ms. Ford took an inductive approach when considering student proficiency levels. Ms. Ford did a thorough job checking the assessment items on the rubrics, and used the marked rubrics as worksheets to decide the proficiency level on the report card. In addition, by adding her own documentation to the existing marking on the passed-on rubrics, Ms. Ford made student progress on reading and writing over time much more visible.

It should be noted that a bottom-up approach, i.e., checking attainment items on rubrics first, then deciding proficiency levels on report cards, seems to orient teachers' attention to details of student performance, instead of ranking students. Pearson, DeStefano, and Garcia (1998) warn that normative comparisons are such an ingrained part of our schooling that even when teachers were provided with evaluative standards, they still tend to think "who does well on tests and who doesn't" (Pearson & DeStefano, 1993). I hypothesize that when teachers spend time considering whether a student is proficient an assessment item and whether s/he should be placed at the beginning, mid, or end of a proficiency level (based on the quantity and quality of the assessment items that s/he attains), teachers are more likely to focus on individual student performance than to rank them.

Use of Information/Assessment Results

Ms. Ford said that the information that she obtained from the assessment helped her interact with students differently because she knew what they had achieved and what else they needed to work on (data source: 4193). For example, after assessing Kristin's reading, Ms. Ford commented that while she had all other skills: picture cues, one-to-one correspondence, and sight vocabulary, Kristin could not independently choose a book and read for 10 minutes (#2 Developing Attitude) or see herself as a reader (#1 of Developing Attitude). Ms. Ford placed Kristin at mid-Developing and selected some books for the student to read.

> (Data source: 97Ford 2407-2410)
> After listening to Kristin read, Ms. Ford told Kristin: "OK, very good. You did a good job. You don't have to read more. You can join the group. OK? These are

> the kinds of books you can choose in the morning to read because I like you to practice the words you can work on. OK."
> "Heee, " Kristin smiled.
> Ms. Ford: "See ya."
>
> (Data source: 97Ford 2455-2488)
> Ms. Ford told me about her grading of Kristin's reading: "She can do this- Gives, supports, responds to the stories read to them (note; #3 Emergent Attitude: 'Gives and supports personal responses to stories read to them'). She can do that." Ms. Ford looked at the Reading Development Continuum and told me: "OK. Independently chooses books—she doesn't really do that or read for ten minutes (#2 Developing Attitude: 'Independently chooses books s/he likes to read and/or look at '). She looks at the pictures when she thought she wasn't sure what the word was. She does look at pictures to try to figure things out. She has one-to-one correspondence (#2 Developing Word Identification: 'Tracks words: has one-to-one correspondence'). She has sight word vocabulary (#3 Developing Word Identification: 'Begins to build a sight word vocabulary to draw up, with automaticity, when reading'), but I don't think at this point she sees herself as a reader (#1 Developing Attitude: 'Sees self as a reader'). So, I will probably put her in the middle of the Developing section."

Ms. Ford also said that if she found out from the assessment that her students had some difficulty with a certain item, she would re-teach and re-assess (data source: 98Carter 4175-4177). Eventually Ms. Ford passed on assessment results to the next year's teacher and the District, which kept track of all students' progress (data source: 98Carter 4179).

To conclude, the information obtained from the assessment was mainly to monitor and evaluate student progress and seemed to have little observable effect on Ms. Ford's instructional decisions. This conclusion is also reported in the Early Literacy Portfolio, although Salinger (1998) maintains that there was still a broad effect on teachers' way of 'doing school' (p. 195). In Ms. Ford's classroom, the observable use of the assessment results was limited to remedial interventions and passing on to the next party (e.g., the District and parents). As mentioned earlier, First, Ms. Ford emphasized the acquisition of

grammatical skills on workbooks and everyday writing and usually applied the information obtained from her classroom observation and work-checking to immediate reinforcement of those skills with individual students. Second, Ms. Ford's interview assessments were usually brief and she seemed to use the assessments to confirm her classroom evaluation. Both points seem to affect Ms. Ford's data collection practices and eventually her use of the assessment results on broader decisions on instruction.

Ms. Reagan

Profile

Ms. Reagan is a second-grade teacher. The 1997-98 school year was Ms. Reagan's 38th year teaching. Ms. Reagan has been in "Washington" School for 21 years since the school opened (data source: 98Reagan 4404-4406). It was Ms. Reagan's last year of teaching. Ms. Reagan would retire the next year but would come back to school to help some of her at-risk students that she taught in the previous year.

Ms. Reagan has a bachelor's in science and major in psychology and minor in sociology. Ms. Reagan went to a private girls' college in the State of "N" where there was no specific teacher program. Ms. Reagan took one term of general teaching and then one term of student teaching. Ms. Reagan has the equivalent of master's but since her husband and her moved around a lot and later she had children, Ms. Reagan did not finish the masters program.

Ms. Reagan has a permanent certification ("I can teach even when I'm 90 . . . if I wanted to") from the State of "M". Ms. Reagan was not quite sure if she still held the certification in the State of "O" but she might in the State of "N". Ms. Reagan said that

one time, she was certified in all three states, "N," "O," and "M," because she taught in all three states (data source: 98Reagan 4421-4440).

Ms. Reagan is a life-time reader and enjoys reading very much. Ms. Reagan said that she could not go to bed without reading for 20 minutes first. Ms. Reagan emphasizes the importance of reading in her classroom.

Assessment Practices

Integration

Ms. Reagan integrated a book-report assessment task into her classroom as a learning activity to reinforce target skills, but did not purposefully collect assessment data on student reading/writing during the activity. Ms. Reagan asked students to identify the setting, character(s), main problem, major events, and solution of the story that they had just read. This was an assessment task although Ms. Reagan did not view it as such. According to Ms. Reagan, the book report merely served the function of a regular classroom activity.

On September 9, 1997, the beginning of the year, Ms. Reagan paired up students and asked them to read one of the books that she gave them and then fill out a book report with their partner. Ms. Reagan gave each pair a "Reading Is Fun" sheet as follows:

(Data source: 97Reagan 267-306).

READING IS FUN

Name:
Title:
Author:
Illustrator:
Characters:
Setting: Time:
Place:

Problem:
Resolution:

I really like this book ____. I don't like this book ____.
Draw your favorite part of the story on the back.

Ms. Reagan encouraged students to work with their partner and, and at the end, Ms. Reagan collected the book report sheets (data source: 97Reagan 325-328 and 393-394). Ms. Reagan told the class, "We'll do this once or twice a week. We'll read our regular book or the book I chose" (data source: 97Reagan 398-401). I observed Ms. Reagan conduct the book report activity again on Steven Kellogg's ten children's books[4] in the next month (October 14, 1997) (data source: 97Reagan 1409-1444).

Ms. Reagan did not say that the book-report activity was to integrate an assessment task to teaching routines in order to collect data for the mandatory reading assessment. Ms. Reagan did tell me in a conversation that her students this year were more advanced than last year so she was able to "teach comprehension" at that time of the year. Ms. Reagan found that the book-report activity was a good tool to teach comprehension.

The assessment program developer, Ms. Johnson, expected an integration of the assessment *methods* (instead of *tasks*) into teaching and to collect student learning data on a day-to-day basis (data source 'Meetings 107-111). In the regard of Ms. Johnson's expectation, Ms. Reagan did not integrate the assessment into her teaching.

---

[4] "The Island of the Skog," "Mike Fink," "Jonny Appleseed," "Mystery of the Stolen Paint," "Pinkerton, Behave!" "Can I keep Him?" "The Day Jimmy's Boa Ate the Wash," "Paul Bunyan," Jimmy's Boa and the Big Splash Birthday," "Prehistoric Pinkerton" (data source: 97Reagan: 1791-1805).

Data Sources

Ms. Reagan's data sources for marking the writing assessments were student writing samples (drafts and final reports), worksheets, and class work over time (data source: 98Reagan 4594-4602). In an interview, for example, Ms. Reagan told me, "Students' rough drafts, notes, and final drafts of that animal report are in student folders to help me assess their writing. I use the whole things when I grade and when I fill out the report card" (data source: 98Reagan 4604-4610).

Ms. Reagan's data sources for marking the reading assessments were mainly from the individual/interview reading assessments that Ms. Reagan conducted for each report card. When interviewing the students, Ms. Reagan used a blank book report sheet, similar to the book report sheet that Ms. Reagan used in the classroom, to write down students' answers on the setting, characters, problem, and solution of the story that they had just read (data source: 98Reagan 4604-4610). Ms. Reagan audio-taped reading for each report card. Ms. Reagan often interrupted students and asked questions to check comprehension. In a conversation with Ms. Reagan on March 11, 1998, Ms. Reagan indicated that when she filled out report cards, she reviewed student answers on the "Setting, Character, Problem and Resolution" sheet, listened to audio tapes, and thought about specific students, (data source: 98Reagan 581-583).

In summary, Ms. Reagan seemed to do the final marking for reading and writing based on multiple sources/evidence that she collected during the one-on-one reading assessment and during regular teaching periods. Ms. Reagan reflected on student responses, checked student worksheets, and reviewed student written answers to the questions of the textbook when Ms. Reagan filled out the report card.

Assessment Methods

Ms. Reagan seemed to be aware of the learning needs/progress of some specific students and the rest of the class in general. Ms. Reagan told me about her ESL and struggling readers, and how quickly the class moved from one reading series to another. Ms. Reagan seemed to obtain the information through observation when she worked with students. I noticed that Ms. Reagan often spent time working with individual students on their reading (e.g., data source: 97Reagan 1201-1202, 1227-1233). In the end-of-project interview, Ms. Reagan indicated that "teacher contact"—"plainly working with the children in the room" was the assessment method that she trusted the most (data source: 98Reagan 4629-4637).

Specifically, on September 9, 1997, Ms. Reagan said that French ESL student, Camilla and Korean ESL student Samuel just needed some English (data source: 98warn 447). One month later (October 14, 1997), Ms. Carter told me that Camilla and Samuel were ready to learn (data source: 97Reagan 1499). After two weeks (October 29, 1997), about two months after the school started, Ms. Reagan told me that Camilla and Samuel were quickly picking up. Ms. Reagan said that the same book series (Reading Milestone) that she used last year with four struggling readers had been going very quickly—"It took them so long last year." Ms. Reagan said that she credited Camilla and Samuel's being talked with and read to at home (data source: 97Reagan 2075-2079). Ms. Reagan also told me that she thought Samuel was further ahead of Camilla—"For Samuel, the motivation is there" (data source: 97Reagan 2083). Later (November 6, 1997), before Ms. Reagan conducted the interview/reading assessment on Camilla for the November

report card, Ms. Reagan told me that Camilla did not work hard enough although she could just do it (97Reagan 4214-4219). In the end-of-project, Ms. Reagan recalled that as soon as Camilla and Samuel finished three levels of Reading Milestone, they started reading first-grade reading material, and were reading with the rest of class by the end of fall 1997 (data source: 98Reagan 4612-4629).

Ms. Reagan definitely observed her students closely when she conducted pullout/reading assessments on individual students. Ms. Reagan observed student eye and body movements closely when they were working on the task (e.g., reading). For example, after assessing Brook's reading on "Following Your Nose," Ms. Reagan told me, "When reading this one, he is struggling a great level. Did you notice how as soon as he started to read in here, he started fidgeting? All this kind of stuff with the shirt, feet started fidgeting, fingers are- I mean it was just- He had such a hard time" (data source: 97Reagan 4050-4054).

Ms. Reagan conducted thorough interviews to assess student reading. She was particularly interested in finding out whether students read with comprehension and fluency. Specifically, to check comprehension, Ms. Reagan asked students to define the major problem of a story without looking at the book. Ms. Reagan wrote down student answers on her own Story Retelling sheets, one for each student. When the student could not answer the question, Ms. Reagan would prompt or rephrase her question and if the student still could not provide an correct answer, Ms. Reagan would move on to the next question. Ms. Reagan then audio-taped the students' reading. It should be noted that reconstructing stories to reflect sequence and story elements (setting, characters, problem, and resolution) was #5 Outcome of Expanding (Grade 2) Comprehension.

(Data source: 97Reagan: 3289-3322)
Tanya was a good reader.
Ms. Reagan: "OK. Tanya what did you read?"
"The Island of the Skog" (Written and illustrated by Steven Kellogg).
Ms. Reagan wrote down the title of the book on the 'Story Retelling' sheet.
Ms. Reagan: "OK. Can you tell me the setting: time and place?"
"Um- The setting is um- The setting is like on the Island of the Skog."
Ms. Reagan: "OK. Did it start out there?"
"It started out at a different time when um and then . ."
Ms. Reagan: "Hm- How did they get to the island?"
Tanya said something.
Ms. Reagan: "Hm- OK. Who are the main characters in this story?"
"M- (10 seconds) the mice."
Ms. Reagan: "Certainly the mice. Who else are the main characters?"
"Skog."
Ms. Reagan: "Hm- Good. OK. Now, what was the main problem of this story?"
Tanya did not answer.
Ms. Reagan: "What was this really about?"
"It's about. It's about the um- the mice went to a new island. "
Ms. Reagan: "M- that certainly is one of the problems in this story. What's the main problem?"
Tanya did not answer.
Ms. Reagan: "That certainly was happening. That happened but that wasn't the main problem. Do you know the main problem of this story is? (7 seconds) Do you remember? (3 seconds) Hu- (10 seconds)"
"The skog got them all."
Ms. Reagan: "He certainly did. If that's the main problem of the story, how was that resolved? How did they end?"
"M- (3 seconds)"
Ms. Reagan: "Remember how we figured out the main problem? It's got to be the most important thing that happened in the story. (3 seconds) OK. Let's come back to that."
Ms. Reagan prepared to record Tanya's reading.

Ms. Reagan seemed to use fluency to check whether a student's book selection was appropriate. This is important because reading material needs to match student reading proficiency so that student reading could be appropriately assessed. When the student struggled with words, Ms. Reagan would discuss with the student whether the book was too hard for him/her. Ms. Reagan usually finished the assessment, and then re-assessed the student on an easier book.

(Data source: 97Reagan 2354-2358)
Ms. Reagan told Susan: "I've noticed that when you were reading to me, you didn't read with a lot of fluency. You were still struggling to get the words. What do you think about this selection?"
"Um- hard."
Ms. Reagan: "I think the book is very hard. I have a lot of admiration for you to trying to read it. I think what I'm going to do is to assess you on another day and to have you choose something that is a little easier." (Note: Ms. Reagan still asked Susan to read the book ("Pecos Bill") on that day and planned to re-assess Susan later with another book.)

On the other hand, when the student read the book too fluently, (and maybe based on what Ms. Reagan knew about that specific student's reading in class), Ms. Reagan would ask the student to find a harder book and to re-take the assessment.

(Data source: 97Reagan 2740-2747]
Ms. Reagan stopped the taping and told Miranda: "All right. You read it very well. Very very well. Let's hear what you sound like." Ms. Reagan rewound and played the tape from the very beginning to the end.
Ms. Reagan stopped the tape and asked, "What do you think? You think you sound pretty good? I think you did it very nicely. OK. What I want you to do is to practice. Go back and practice (the name of a book), not today. I'm going to have you do it another time. Will you ask the next person to come out?" Miranda left.

Fluency was not just a key for Ms. Reagan to check the appropriateness of reading materials. Ms. Reagan emphasized the importance of reading with fluency and she modeled the level of fluency that she expected from the student.

(Data source: 97Reagan 2363-2371)
After Susan's reading ("Pecos Bill"), Ms. Reagan told Susan: "Great. I have great admiration for you to choose a hard book like this. But, remember we talked about choosing something that is too hard? Because when you read a book like this . . . This is what I'm listening for--" Ms. Reagan demonstrated the reading with fluency. Ms. Reagan read, "One day a drifter named Chuck stumbled across Bill while he was taking a nap. He asked Bill what he meant by snoozing in the brush without his trousers. Bill tried to explain that he was a coyote." Ms. Reagan asked Susan: "Did you see the difference? I'm looking for that fluency. You simply don't have it in this piece, do you? Do you think you do? No. So, I think we'll do it again on Thursday, and I'm going to have you choose something that is little easier. OK?"

Ms. Reagan reinforced idioms, pictures, and vocabulary when assessing reading. Specifically, Ms. Reagan usually asked questions to find out whether the student understood the idioms in the text. When the student could not answer, Ms. Reagan would try to reinforce some reading strategies. Ms. Reagan would then explain the idiom to the student in the context of the story.

> (Data source: 97Reagan 2372-2386)
> After Susan's reading, Ms. Reagan told her: "I wrote down some words here. Do you know what 'pepper' meant when he says 'Bill decided to give life as a Texan a try. He borrowed Chuck extra clothes and *peppered him with questions.*' What did he do? Do you know what that means?"
> Susan did not answer.
> Ms. Reagan: "OK. When you read something and you don't know what it means, what should you do?"
> "Ask?"
> Ms. Reagan: "Sure! You have no idea what that means? What am I doing to you right now?"
> "Asking me questions."
> Ms. Reagan: "That is exactly what that means. It's just a different way of saying it. He peppered him with questions. Remember this is a book that a young man who has been living with a coyote for years. He's never been around with people. He doesn't know what is like to be around people. He lives out there with the coyote."

Ms. Reagan reinforced picture cues with beginning and ESL readers. For example, Ms. Reagan asked questions to check whether students would use the pictures cues to answer the questions. If the student still could not answer the questions, Ms. Reagan would use the pictures to explain to the student.

> (Data source: 97Reagan 4456-4500)
> After Camilla's reading ("Clifford, A Big Red Dog"), Ms. Reagan asked Camilla (a French ESL student): "Good. OK. Now, do you know what the story problem was in here? What was wrong? What is it? There is a problem in here. Do you know what it is? Clifford doesn't like that kitten, does he?" Camilla did not answer. Ms. Reagan turned the pages, pointed at pictures and asked Camilla again. Ms. Reagan reviewed the story for Camilla by reviewing pictures.

> Ms. Reagan: "Remember back here? Remember back here when Emily Elizabeth says she had only one pet, which was Clifford. Kitten comes and they take care of him." Ms. Reagan pointed at the picture. "Look at what Clifford do, he can't get into the house. He got very close [to the house]." Camilla pointed to the picture and told Ms. Reagan, "Look, he's here."
> Ms. Reagan said, "I know that's why- " and laughed.
> Ms. Reagan continued, "That's why her Mom says that the kitten has to stay outside. She was afraid Clifford was going to knock the house down."

Furthermore, Ms. Reagan reinforced vocabulary and complicated phrases (including meaning-detection methods) with students. Sometimes, Ms. Reagan also explained unfamiliar vocabulary to students, when the concept seemed to be foreign to the student.

> (Data source: 98Reagan 258-275)
> Aaron (a beginning reader) read: "The Hole In the Dike" (Retold by Norma Green)
> Aaron read: "A long time ago, a boy named Peter lived in Holland. He lived with his mother and father in a cottage next to a tulip field . . . Take the short-cut along the top of the dike, his friend said."
> After Aaron read one page, Ms. Reagan stopped the tape and asked, "Do you understand that (note: the dike)?" Ms. Reagan pointed at the picture. Ms. Reagan took out a crayon and a piece of paper. Aaron was looking at four girls walking by. Ms. Reagan used Lake Michigan and Holland as an example. Ms. Reagan drew a picture of dyke and said, "This is a dyke. Because this is a big strong wall, they can't go over the wall."

It seemed that spending some time during the reading assessment to ensure that the students would continue to read (throughout the rest of their life) was important for Ms. Reagan. For example, at the end of the reading assessment, Ms. Reagan often reminded the beginning readers of the importance of being literate in life. Ms. Reagan told Aaron (after he read "Recess Mess"): "You need to know how to read here. They're 'Boys' and 'Girls' (in the story). But, how about at the grocery store? Is it important for you to know how to read things at the grocery store?" (data source: 97Reagan 3541) Ms.

Reagan also inquired about the reading time that Aaron spent at home and encouraged him to read more.

> (Data source: 97Reagan 3574-3594)
> At the end of the reading assessment, Ms. Reagan asked Aaron: "How much practice time do you spend on reading now? How much reading do you do at night?"
> "I don't know. I didn't get done yesterday, but I'll get some done today."
> Ms. Reagan: "OK. How much time should you read every night?"
> "Ten minutes."
> Ms. Reagan: "Not enough. Let's try for at least--"
> "20 minutes."
> Ms. Reagan: "That would be better. That would be better. If you practice something for 20 minutes every single night, you will- You're a smart boy. Aaron, you will be SO pleased how good that you could do and how much better you could read, if you just practice every single night. OK. You did a super job. You may go back to the classroom."
> "Can I take this book?"
> Ms. Reagan: "Home? Certainly, just bring it back."
> "Thanks."
> Ms. Reagan: "Of course, you know that."
> Aaron left.
> Ms. Reagan: "Just bring it back to me, all right?"
> "All right."
> Ms. Reagan: "All right. Put it in your backpack. I'm delighted to have you take that."

Ms. Reagan cared about the student's wellbeing and she expressed her feelings to her students during the one-on-one reading assessments. Some of Ms. Reagan's students would go to a different school next year, and Ms. Reagan would retire at the end of that school year. The data below was not for assessment purposes but an illustration of how the teachers used the interview assessment completely different from what the District expected.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Data source: 98Reagan 2479-2484)
Ms. Reagan: "Now, you are going to- I'll let you go ahead and read 'Swimming' because I don't have time to go through all of- Miranda, you are going to be going to (name) [Elementary School] next year[5]?"
"Yes."
Ms. Reagan: "And so is Camilla!"
Ms. Reagan: "I'm worried about you not knowing anybody."
Miranda: "Kay's going too."
Ms. Reagan: "And Kay is going too! Camilla's mom was worried that she wouldn't know anybody over there. Now, I know that- you are going to be OK."

Nevertheless, Ms. Reagan had four major concerns about interview assessments. Ms. Reagan was concerned about (1) the monetary cost, (2) the inconsistent assessment results and procedures among teachers (98Reagan 4754-4758), (3) the low level of standards, and (4) the challenge of interviewing ESL students. Specifically, Ms. Reagan suggested that the District hire "trained testers" to do the interview assessment and have the classroom teachers re-assess those students that did not reach the grade-level standards.

(Data source: 98Reagan 4480-4494)
(In the end-of-project interview) Ms. Reagan told me: "The worst about the assessment, I think, is a terrible waste of money! I mean when you figure at any given time when we're assessing, you have three certified teachers (note: K-2) sitting one-on-one in the library working with a kid. You got anywhere from 100 to 150 thousands dollars worth of teachers sitting (laughing), and you got a 52-dollar or 56-dollar teacher in your class. I don't think that's economically sound. MY feeling is- what I really like to see them do is trained testers. Have a group of trained people who do nothing but assess! They'll get much fairer test results than we do. I mean I know the way Joyce tests and the way I test is different. We get very different answers. But, if you have one group of people that are actually trained to do it, I think, it makes more sense! Pay them to do it. Just standardized the way you do it. But then nobody listens. I mean--you know. Does that make any sense to you?"

[5] There would be district wide school re-zoning in the 1998-99 school year. "Washington" School would lose one third of the students, from 450 to 300.

Ms. Reagan was also concerned that the (interview) assessment was not for every student, but "certainly very good" for at-risk students. In the end-of-project interview, Ms. Reagan told me: "Do I think it is necessary for every kid to go through it (note: the interview assessment)? No. And it wasn't designed for that. It was designed for a spot check for at-risk kids" (data source: 98Reagan 4442-4447). Ms. Reagan believed that the assessment provided specific information about the reading (and math) skills that at-risk students were lacking, which Ms. Reagan believed would eventually help teachers provide remedial assistance. On the other hand, Ms. Reagan said that students who came to the second grade reading and writing well would not need "that specific kind of testing." I asked Ms. Reagan if it was because the students' proficiency level was above the assessment standards. Ms. Reagan replied: "I guess. They are far above the minimum standards" (data source: 4452-4457).

Ms. Reagan's third concern was that interviewing ESL students to assess their math was a challenge for her. Ms. Reagan said, "One of the frustrating thing I had with my ESL kids is that I couldn't assess them for a long time. You can't assess a child on something when they can't speak or understand the language" (data source: 98Reagan 4556). "The problem with the assessment is the language part. Unless they can understand me and I can understand them, they can only do the simple math. They need time" (data source: 98Reagan 4764-4765).

Sometimes it was hard for Ms. Reagan to get the message across. Ms. Reagan simplified her English but the ESL student still did not understand Ms. Reagan's question. It seemed that the student could only answer simple yes-no and either-or questions but not wh-questions, because of his limited command on English.

(Data source: 97Reagan 2900-2951)
Samuel (a Korean ESL beginning reader) came with the book, "At the Carnival."
Ms. Reagan: "All right Samuel. Let's see. OK. What do you choose to read today?"
Samuel showed his book to Ms. Reagan.
Ms. Reagan: "What's the name of your book?"
"At the-"
Ms. Reagan: "You know what we call that?"
Samuel did not answer.
Ms. Reagan: "Car-ni-val."
"Carnival," Samuel repeated.

Ms. Reagan: "Have you ever been to a carnival?"
"Yeah."
Ms. Reagan: "Where, here in the United States or in Korea?"
"Korea."
Ms. Reagan: "Wow, what's your favorite ride?"
Samuel did not answer.
Ms. Reagan: "I thought you like to ride. What do you like to ride on?"
"M-"
Ms. Reagan: "What's your favorite ride?"
"Five (?)."
Ms. Reagan: "A bike?"
"Yeah.

Ms. Reagan took out the "Story Retelling" sheet and asked, "All right, what's the name of the story?"
"At the (4 seconds) car-"
Ms. Reagan: "At The Carnival? OK. Can you tell me--Where did that story take place? Do you know where this story took place?"
"Place."
Ms. Reagan: "Right. Where?"
"Um-"
Ms. Reagan pointed at the cover picture and asked, "Out of. What do we call that?"
Samuel did not answer.
Ms. Reagan: "Is that a fair, car or something like that?"
"Um-"
Ms. Reagan: "Hu- Not too sure, OK. OK. Do you know who's in there?"
"Yeah."
Ms. Reagan: "Is there a problem?"
"Yeah."
Ms. Reagan: "What was the problem?"
"Um-"
Ms. Reagan: "Hm-"
"M-"

> Ms. Reagan: "Do you know what the problem? Do you know problems?"
> "No."
> Ms. Reagan: "No. OK. Let's skip all of this stuff and just let you read to me (laughing). All right? OK. Now, what I'm going to ask you to do is to tell me your name. Tell me the name of the book and today's date. OK. Do that for me?"

In summary, Ms. Reagan conducted thorough reading assessment on reading , although she had serious concern about the interview assessments. Ms. Reagan emphasized reading with comprehension and fluency, and Ms. Reagan used the assessment to fulfill that goal through a great deal of reinforcement, prompting, and remedial teaching. Ms. Reagan also expressed her caring to students during the assessment.

Ms. Reagan conducted student self-assessments and asked students to evaluate the fluency, smoothness, and expression of their own reading. For the first (November) report card, Ms. Reagan either asked her students to comment on their own recording or to compare their recordings of two texts.

> (Data source: 97Reagan 4200-4211) 11/6/97
> After Mary's reading, Ms. Reagan rewound and played the tape from the beginning. Mary followed the tape and re-read the story. Ms. Reagan did not listen to the whole tape. Ms. Reagan stopped the tape asked Mary, "What do you think?"
> "M-"
> Ms. Reagan: "Do you like the way you sound?"
> "Hm."
> Ms. Reagan: "I do too. You read very smoothly. Read very nicely. Would you do me a favor, please? Could you go get Camilla for me? Nice job."

> (Data source: 97Reagan 4016-4039) 11/6/97
> Ms. Reagan told Brook, "Listen to the way you read this one. Listen to this. Listen to the difference." Ms. Reagan played the recording of "Recess Mess" (Brook read earlier today) and then the recording of "Following Your Nose" (Brook had just read.) Ms. Reagan: "Now, what do you notice the biggest difference?"
> "M-"

Ms. Reagan: "Hm? Which book did you read more fluently?"
"Recess Mess"
Ms. Reagan: "Hm- Hm- Do you know what would make it easier to read this book (Note: "Following Your Nose")?"
"Yeah."
Ms. Reagan: "Read lots and lots of easy stuff. Don't try to read really hard stuff."
"OK."

For the second and third (March and June) report cards, Ms. Reagan first played students' old recording (for a previous report card) and asked for their comments. Ms. Reagan then informed the student what she was looking for in the coming reading/recording. After the student finished the reading and recording, Ms. Reagan usually played the tape to the student and asked for comments on the new recording and the difference between the new recording and the old one.

(Data source: 98Reagan 529-531 and 558-559)
Ms. Reagan rewound and played the old tape to Bruce.
Ms. Reagan stopped the tape and asked, "What do you hear in your reading?"
"Slowly."
Ms. Reagan taped Bruce's reading.
Ms. Reagan rewound and played the tape to Bruce and asked for his own opinion.
Bruce said that he read "a little more clear" this time.
Ms. Reagan said, "I also like the way you read."

Ms. Reagan appeared to conduct the self-assessment slightly different each time. Sometimes, Ms. Reagan would just ask the student, "What do you think?" and/or "Do you like the way you sound?" (data source: 97Reagan 4200-4211) Sometimes, Ms. Reagan would ask students to compare two recordings—" What do you notice the biggest difference?" (data source: 97Reagan 4016-4039). Sometimes, when the feature of the recording or the answer to the self-assessment were obvious to the student and to Ms. Reagan, Ms. Reagan would simply comment: "So much more clearly" (data source: 98Reagan 2493-2510).

It should be noted that Ms. Reagan was the only teacher who asked students to evaluate their own reading. Although Ms. Reagan's students were not given a complete set of grading criteria, students were asked to be aware of the fluency and smoothness featured in their own reading.

Ms. Reagan indicated that she kept writing samples and assessment results in each student's folder/portfolio. Ms. Reagan kept all folders/portfolios in a file box. The information in the portfolio was for Ms. Reagan to fill out the report cards. Ms. Reagan allowed me to look at one portfolio that Ms. Reagan kept for a student in the 1996-97 school year. I found that Ms. Reagan kept the following information for that student:

1. First Grade Mathematics Criteria (note: evaluative rubric for each mathematics outcomes).
2. Alphabet Inventory (note: The letters that the student could not name were circled.)
3. A worksheet.
4. "Developmental Spelling" (note: sample writing on beginning sounds, consonants, initial and final consonants, vowel/consonant combinations, words, and standard spelling)
5. "Letter Recognition/Sound Association" (note: a check of the time that the student could name each capital and small case letter and sound).
6. Second Grade Mathematics Criteria.
7. Second Grade Report Card (note: mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies).
8. Reading Development Continuum
9. Writing Development Continuum
10. Reading Continuum Checklist (note: same as Reading Development Continuum but with a vertical layout)
11. Writing Continuum Checklist (note: same as Writing Development Continuum but with a vertical layout)

Communication

There seemed to be some personal communication (on assessments) between Ms. Reagan and other teachers. Ms. Reagan seemed to be aware of how another second-

grade teacher, Joy, conducted the assessments. As Ms. Reagan described to me, she and Joy discussed their assessment schedule and arrangement.

> (Data source: 98Reagan 4754-4757)
> Ms. Reagan told me: "Now, Joy (a first/second grade teacher) does the assessments in the classroom during specials[6] and I admire her tremendously. She gives up all of her time and the kids have given up their special too. She also assessed during lunch hours and something like that. I won't give up my time. I find that trying to assess one child while the rest were in here is difficult."

There was (almost) no communication between Ms. Reagan and the third grade teachers regarding the assessment results and student K-2 portfolios/folders. According to Ms. Reagan, no third grade teacher has ever asked for Ms. Reagan's K-2 assessment results. Ms. Reagan said that she had been waiting but none of the third-grade teachers came (except once for a special case) (data source: 98Reagan 4666-4703).

Information Gained from Rubrics

Generally speaking, Ms. Reagan believes that the K-2 performance assessment provided information about individual students' learning needs--"You have a clear idea what each child was doing" (97Reagan 2092-2096). Ms. Reagan said that the assessment particularly benefited 'at-risk' students because it provided information about these students' learning needs. Ms. Reagan said, "It gives you a lot of specific information that you can work on with kids that were missing those particular skills, both on reading and math" (data source: 98Reagan: 4446). Nonetheless, Ms. Reagan did not think that the assessment would provide information to help students who read well (data source:

[6] At this school, "specials" are classes held outside regular classrooms, for example, music, computer, gym, and arts.

98Reagan 4452).

Ms. Reagan admitted that comparing student performance against the rubrics provided her with information about student learning needs. Among the assessment outcomes listed in the reading rubric, Ms. Reagan particularly emphasized the performance of re-telling story elements. Ms. Reagan developed a Story Retelling form to document the student's response. Ms. Reagan audio-taped student reading, and marked the rubric ("Reading continuum Checklist") during and immediately after one-on-one reading assessments.

> (Data source: 98Reagan 3211-3215)
> Ms. Reagan: "So, what are you going to read to me today?"
> "It Wasn't My Fault. (by Helen Lesler)"
> Ms. Reagan: "OK. Was it 'It wasn't My Fault'?" Ms. Reagan took out the report card and wrote down the title of the book on the report card. Ms. Reagan also took out the reading continuum.

At the end of each year, Ms. Reagan had two sheets of Story Retelling/Reading-Writing Report forms and the marked rubric stapled for each student. All the information, including the audio-tapes and student responses were reviewed when Ms. Reagan marked the report card (data source: 98Reagan 4248-4261). The District did not require Ms. Reagan to tape student reading or use the Story Retelling form. Yet, Ms. Reagan extended the assessment practice in such a way that student performance could be systematically and repeated evaluated against the rubrics.

To conclude, Ms. Reagan believes that the assessment (especially the interview assessment) was mainly for struggling students because it reveals information about the skills that these students still need. This view is supported by Borko et al. (1993). These authors report that teachers who incorporate performance assessments in their classroom have greater understanding about their below grade-level students, which I believe

includes the skills that struggling students still need as well as the skills they already possess. This opinion is supported by the study of three other teachers in the present study. These teachers indicated that the assessments tracked progress of all students, including struggling students. Nonetheless, it seemed that the information that revealed the skills that struggling students still needed was considered more "useful" for Ms. Reagan, in terms of providing remedial interventions.

Use of Information/Assessment Results

Ms. Reagan used the information obtained from the assessment mainly to give individual students advice and to make pedagogical decisions. For example, after a reading assessment, Ms. Reagan concluded that a Chinese ESL student did not read a specific story series well enough and assigned a book of that series as homework for the student to practice at home.

> (Data source: 98warn 311-315) 3/11/98
> After Jacob's reading, Ms. Reagan asked him: "Who's this story about?"
> Jacob had problem to retell the last names of characters or the setting.
> Ms. Reagan: "Have you read The Boxer Children before?"
> "No."
> Ms. Reagan: "I'm going to send this book (note: a Boxer Children book) home and you can read it. Then you can read it to me again."

Later in the reading assessment for the June report card, Ms. Reagan noticed that Jacob had limited experience with Western culture. Ms. Reagan encouraged him to read through a variety of American fiction, especially folk tales, in the summer.

> (Data source: 98Reagan 3455-3481)
> Ms. Reagan stopped the tape and asked Jacob, "What do you think? Do you think you sound smoother, better?".
> "I guess."

Ms. Reagan: "I do. I think very much so. One thing you need to do when you read in the summer, is to go to the library and try to find some-"
Jacob: "Chapter books?"
Ms. Reagan: "Books, yes, chapter books. Find some mystery stories, science fiction-"
Jacob: "Folk tales."
Ms. Reagan: "Folk tales. Try and read as many different kinds of books as possible. Do you know why you always ask me what's going on in the story? Do you speak Chinese at home?"
Jacob: "Yes."
Ms. Reagan: "OK. Part of the reason that you always ask me what's happening in the story is because you don't read any English. So, go to all the fairy tales, read Cinderella read-"
Jacob: "Have you . . movie . .?" (mild laughing)
Ms. Reagan: "No! No. You can't buy the movie. You know how I feel about that (note: Jacob was laughing). You read the book first, Jacob. You're perfectly capable of. Read Sleeping Beauty. Read Frog Prince."
Jacob: "If I can find them."
Ms. Reagan: "I have them in the room. I have them in the room."
"You do?"
Ms. Reagan: "Yeah. I do. But, you just need to read a variety of American fictions. OK? OK. You are doing very well though. All right, you may go. Back to your seat. You'll get your tape. You will get your tape at the end of the year. Nice job!"

In my opinion, the interview assessment did provide Ms. Reagan with information of good readers' learning needs. From the one-on-one reading assessments for the November (1997) report card, Ms. Reagan found out that even her advanced reader(s) could not articulate accurately the primary problem of the story they read. Thus, Ms. Reagan decided to give students more practice on these skills, i.e., to read with comprehension and to define the primary story problem.

(Data source: 97Reagan 2518-2525)
After Alvin's reading for the November (1997) report card, Ms. Reagan told me, "I think he's (Alvin) much more fluent (note: probably than the previous reader Susan)."
"Hm."
Ms. Reagan: "Except he missed the point of the story. He likes to read. He did not know how the problem was solved. Oh, well, he's very fluent. This group of students read much better than last year and they read a wide variety of books, but

> they still have problems finding the main idea and problem of a story. They need more practice."

On the other hand, it seemed that the assessment results could not help Ms. Reagan diagnose student learning problem(s), although results did indicate student reading proficiency. For example, Ms. Reagan noticed some unusual reading behavior of a student when he read a difficult text, but Ms. Reagan could not conclude what the problem really was. Ms. Reagan said that she would refer the student to a reading specialist to diagnose his reading problem. In fact, Ms. Reagan had conducted some diagnostic tests on the student at the beginning of the school year, but Ms. Reagan could not tell what the problem was (see data source: 97Reagan 471-500).

Furthermore, Ms. Reagan did not think that the *assessment* program improved student reading. Ms. Reagan believed that it was the new *reading* program (the Heath series) that resulted in improvement on reading. It should be noted that Ms. Reagan did not mention that the information obtained from the assessment helped her teach reading.

> (Data source: 98Reagan 4647-4664)
> It was about the same time when we started the assessment, we got moved to a new reading program. I think the assessment fits with the new reading program better than the old one."
> Ashley asked, "What was the old one?"
> Ms. Reagan: "Cat. It's a much more a basil type, where you have reading groups. Unfortunately, the kids that have the most difficult time learning to read were the one that were always stuck in the very simple books. With our new text-"
> "You mean Heath or?"
> "Hm, Heath. It encourages whole group reading and then moves up to other things. I think that's going to help. Can I give that (note: credit) to the assessment? No. I give that to the new reading program. The assessment certainly benefit from it, because the performance is so much better. I think. But, I don't think the assessment makes them perform better. I think it's"
> Ashley: "No. It's the program."
> Ms. Reagan: "The program."

Ms. Reagan read every student's portfolio/folder that was passed on by the first-grade and kindergarten teachers, and felt that she benefited from the information. Thus, Ms. Reagan thought the information that she collected was important for the third- and fourth-grade teachers because the information would help them know the reading/writing status of this group of second-grade students.

> (Data source: 98Reagan 4720-4793)
> Ms. Reagan: "I read all of my kids' assessments. I mean I read through them. You know. I'm really pleased that somebody like Nelson- I mean, he was not achieving very well last year in the first grade. He turns fine now."
> "Yeah, I can tell."
> Ms. Reagan: "Yes. This group of students are, you know, showing a lot of growth. Eventually, I do have to give those folders to the third-grade teachers because they have to go on to the third grade so they can put the stuff from third grade and move it on the floor."

Yet, Ms. Reagan told me that the information that she gathered was still waiting for the third grade teacher(s) to come to look at. "It is interesting, especially when you think of the hours and the manpower that goes into doing this test. To have someone basically tell you 'Well, we are not interested,' is sad!" Nobody ever stopped by, according to Ms. Reagan. It was a frustrating experience for Ms. Reagan.

> (Data source: 98Reagan 4666-4703)
> In the end-of-project interview, I asked Ms. Reagan what she would do with the assessment results that she collected for the three report cards.
> Ms. Reagan replied: "This is the sad thing. After the assessment I made folders. Now, the folders from my second graders were sitting right over there, that blue box. There isn't a single third-grade teacher who's come and asked for them."
> "Didn't you pass them to them or"
> Ms. Reagan: "I asked them in the fall if they wanted them and they said that they didn't want them right now. So I have been waiting for them to ask me for them. They never did!"
> "What's in there?"
> Ms. Reagan: "All of the assessment data that I got last year"
> "Like continuum (note: rubric)?"
> Ms. Reagan: "Hm"

"And all the check(list)"
Ms. Reagan: "Hm, hm, hm. After talking to the third grade teachers, I think they don't want to look at that, and they want to make up their own mind."
"So, what did you pass on to them?"
Ms. Reagan: "I ain't passing any!"
"How about the folders that you have been creating that you used for your report cards."
Ms. Reagan: "They didn't want it!"
"That's funny (laugh)"
Ms. Reagan: "I think it is true. I think it is true!"
"You spent so much time and"
Ms. Reagan: "Bingo! Bingo! They feel that they really would prefer to know the children by themselves. They don't want to"
"They don't want to double check?"
Ms. Reagan: "No! Evidently not. So, what do I personally think? I think it's busy work for kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers. Then, nobody looked at that, which I think it's a shame! But again, you know they could just simply go back to use it as a tool for at-risk kids-"
"Especially- yes."
Ms. Reagan: "Sure! Sure, sure. I had only a person who came and got a folder from me this fall. It was Ms. Rosevoalt and that was because she has a family she wanted to know where a specific student was. Which, again, is an at-risk kid!"

To conclude, first, Ms. Reagan used the information obtained from the reading/interview assessment to assign reading to help students of ALL proficiency levels. Ms. Reagan did not appear to tailor her instruction to fulfill individual student reading needs in class (as discussed in Ms. Nixon's class; also Marzao, 1995), but she usually spent time even during the assessment negotiating a work plan with individual students to improve their reading. In fact, as in the other three classrooms, the teachers mainly used assessment results to consider remedial/intervention activities to help students hit targets, rather than to re-consider their overall instructional strategies.

Second, the assessment results did not really provide information about "what went wrong with a student." As discussed before, this requires individual teachers to ask probing questions (Herman, Aschbacher, & Winter, 1992). Thus, it was crucial that Ms.

Reagan asked Jacob whether he spoke English at home when Ms. Reagan noticed that Jacob could not re-tell the setting of the story he read. Ms. Reagan suspected that there was a cultural factor involved and she took an active role to find out. It seemed that the assessment could only tell Ms. Reagan that Jacob could not retell stories if she did not ask probing questions.

Summary

Several themes emerged in this chapter on the aspects of assessment practices, information gained, and use of the assessment results, which are the three research focuses of this study. To summarize, first, on the aspect of assessment practices, the K-2 performance assessment program seemed to allow a high degree of autonomy at the classroom level. This autonomy appeared to encourage teacher use of the assessment program as a personal tool and significantly affect teacher trust of and professional development on assessment procedures. For example, Ms. Nixon felt that the assessment design matched her goal-oriented personality and used the assessment to evaluate her own teaching effectiveness. Ms. Carter used the one-on-one interviews to reinforce target skills and to give students plenty of opportunity to read. Ms. Ford conducted comparatively brief interview assessments to confirm her classroom evaluation. Ms. Reagan conducted extensive interviews to reinforce the importance of reading with comprehension, fluency, and self-awareness. Furthermore, teachers appeared to use quality-control devices to ensure the trustworthiness of the assessment. For example, they adjusted task-difficulty to match proficiency levels, adopted a strict standard when they graded, and they grounded their evaluation in pieces of evidence in context.

Second, on the aspect of information gained, the alignment of the rubrics and curriculum learning outcomes seemed to be necessary so that information obtained reveals details of student learning. It appears that the rubrics were mainly used as a conceptual framework on information gathering and documentation. Ms. Reagan provided a good example of direct questioning to obtain information of student learning problems on reading.

Third, on the aspect of using the assessment results, it seems that teachers mainly used the information to consider remedial teaching activities and interventions. Teachers did not seem to use the assessment results to change overall teaching strategies or methods. On the other hand, teachers seemed to use the assessment results to keep track of individual student progress rather than to rank them. It should also be noted that using rubric-referenced assessment results for accountability purposes is practically possible.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to examine the three aspects (i.e., assessment practices, information gained, and use of assessment results) across the four teachers with references to literature reviewed in Chapter One and Two to answer my three research questions and to illustrate the significance of the present study. This chapter is organized by the three research questions, followed by educational implications on assessment design, scoring and marking, information gained, direct questioning technique, and impact on instruction. At the end of this chapter, a summary of educational implications, research implications, limitations of this study, and final thoughts are also given.

Summary Discussion

Assessment Practices

(Research Question #1: How did the teachers' behavior/practice vary from District expectations in the administration of the K-2 Performance Assessment Program on reading/writing, and why?

District Expectations

The goals of the assessment program were to track student progress and eventually to use the assessment results to provide intervention to close achievement gaps. The District expected teachers to integrate the four assessment methods (i.e., observation, interview, portfolio, and student self-assessment) into their day-to-day

teaching so that assessment data could be gathered from multiple sources across contexts and immediate intervention could be provided.

Specifically, the District expected teachers to observe students during regular instruction, compare student performance against rubrics, and document their observations. For interview assessment, the District expected teachers to assess student thinking processes and level of understanding, conduct remedial teaching during the assessment, and *only* assess students who did not perform in class. The District also expected teachers to involve students in the process of assessment. The District hoped to see teachers ask students to evaluate their own reading and writing through student self-assessments and portfolio assessments. The District expected student portfolios to include writing samples, reading logs, and notes of student learning on reading and writing over time. The District encouraged teachers to support one another, for example, through re-assessing the same students, or discussing assessment results. Finally, the District expected teachers to use the assessment results to provide immediate and appropriate interventions if necessary.

Classroom Practices

Generally speaking, teachers were not equally comfortable with the four assessment methods. It appeared that teachers preferred observation and interview and maintained a working system to gather information of student reading and writing. Teachers did not quite fully explore the use of portfolio assessments to diagnose learning needs or to involve students in student self-assessment.

Specifically, all teachers observed their students during whole-class activities, reading groups, and individual interactions with the students, although not all teachers documented their observations and they varied to a degree in taking a systematic approach when they observed. When observing, teachers usually did not just focus on assessment items (or rubrics) but also focused on students' general learning.

All four teachers appeared to make special efforts three times a year to conduct one-on-one interview assessments to assess reading. This practice was not what the District expected to see. Yet, teachers tended to take the one-on-one opportunity to pinpoint reading skills against the rubric (claimed by Ms. Carter and Ms. Nixon) and/or to know the extent to which students read with fluency and comprehension (practiced by Ms. Reagan). Teachers usually conducted remedial teaching during the interview assessment, but it was not common to observe teachers explore student thinking processes.

On the other hand, exceeding the District's expectations, the four teachers appeared to add their own personality and belief to their interview assessment practice. For example, Ms. Carter is a compassionate teacher and she took the opportunity of interview assessments to establish self-confidence and encouraged students to read. Ms. Ford is an efficient teacher and felt her responsibility for the rest of the class, so her interviews were usually brief (and she would rather observe students closely when she worked with them than to use the class time to interview them). Ms. Nixon is goal-oriented and she counted on detailed information obtained from interviews to set goals and to evaluate her own teaching and student accomplishment. Ms. Reagan is a lifetime

reader and her interview assessments emphasized reading with fluency and comprehension.

As far as the portfolio assessment is concerned, all four teachers collected writing samples in their portfolios. All teachers used actual writing samples to assess writing. They appeared to examine writing from a variety of sources, for example, journals (Ms. Carter and Ms. Nixon), stories (Ms. Carter, Ms. Ford, and Ms. Nixon), dictation (Ms. Nixon), book-reports (Ms. Reagan), letters (Ms. Carter, Ms. Ford, and Ms. Reagan), and worksheets (Ms. Ford and Ms. Reagan).

Ms. Carter kept a reading log for the class and Ms. Nixon wrote observational notes on the report card, but it is not clear whether these two documents were included in student portfolios to diagnose achievement gaps as the District expected. As mentioned before, there was no student involvement in the portfolio assessment processes.

Student self-assessment was not common in the classrooms, except in Ms. Reagan's. Ms. Reagan asked students to assess their own reading fluency and smoothness during the interview assessments. Ms. Carter commented that the learning outcomes listed in reading/writing rubrics were too complicated for first graders. Peer-reviews were more common activities in classrooms (e.g., Ms. Nixon, Carter, and Reagan).

On the other hand, exceeding the District's expectations, Ms. Nixon integrated assessment tasks into her classroom. Ms. Nixon pulled out students periodically to identify letter names and sounds (which was an assessment task) to collect base line data.

The similarity of data sources that the four teachers counted on when assessing writing and reading was surprising. All used genuine samples collected from classroom

writing activities. All, except Ms. Reagan, articulated that they included their observation of student writing attitudes when they assessed writing (note: Ms. Reagan accumulated non-final drafts to assess students' writing process). All four teachers pulled out students to read to them. All, except Ms. Ford, indicated that they used the individual reading assessment as their major data source to assess reading (Ms. Ford emphasized the significance of her own observation during reading groups).

More significantly, all teachers appeared to refer to more than one data source when assessing reading and writing. They drew upon observational as well actual writing samples to assess writing. That is, they looked at student writing attitudes and products. They observed student reading during regular classroom activities throughout the year, and they also closely examined their students' reading proficiency when they pulled out individual students. On the other hand, none of the four teachers used student self-assessments or involved students in the process of the assessment as the District expected.

Generally speaking, the District's expectations of communication among (K-2) teachers did not materialize in classrooms. I did not observe teachers engage in discussion on their assessment practices or results on a regular basis. When there were contradictory opinions about students' reading/writing skills graded by previous year's teachers, teachers of the present year usually did not confront colleagues on the issue, but simply replaced others' opinions with their own. Ms. Ford indicated that time constraints prevented her from meeting with her colleagues. Ms. Carter said that she usually obtained the same response such as "Children probably forgot over the summer" when she confronted her colleagues for an explanation.

All teachers spent time communicating with parents. Yet, it is not clear the extent to which teachers discussed their concerns about the assessment program with the District. For example, Ms. Nixon and Ms. Reagan commented that the assessment standards were too low for their grade, and Ms. Carter did not want the District to take away the time for interview assessments.

To conclude, the K-2 Performance Assessment Program seemed to become a self-sufficient system in each of the four classrooms. Teachers had full authority to plan and execute the assessments. They collected data from multiple sources through in-class observation (to obtain overviews of learning attitudes and attainments) and spot checks (i.e., through interviews). This is valuable because the assessments seemed to be localized in each classroom and obtained ownership from teachers. On the other hand, in-service could be recommended to facilitate teacher use of student-self assessment and portfolios. The District could also demonstrate to teachers how interactions with peers are important in this assessment program.

Information Gained

(Research Question #2: What information did the teachers actually obtain and how? To what extent was the information obtained limited to what was specified in evaluation rubrics?)

The backbone of the K-2 Performance Assessment Program was the evaluative rubrics/continua which specified a variety of reading and writing skills at each grade level. The District would like to see teachers internalize the reading and writing rubrics and constantly use them as standards to evaluate student performance; i.e., to identify student reading and writing skills on respective rubrics. The District did not specify the

number of items that a student should perform at a level on the rubric to be placed at a specific level on the report card.

All four teachers internalized the rubrics to a great degree. Repetition did the magic—teachers reviewed the rubrics and checked about 25 students' performance three times a year, and they repeated the same process every year. Generally speaking, through repeatedly identifying student reading and writing skills specified in the rubrics, all four teachers were informed about student reading/writing proficiency on the assessment outcomes over time. For example, a marked assessment item, such as 'Tracks words: has one-to-one correspondence' (a Word Identification skill at the Developing level in the reading rubric) in November, would become '*Steven* has one-to-one correspondence for the November report card.'

In fact, all the reading/writing skills listed on the rubrics were started with a verb in the third person singular, for example, "*Sees* self as" "*Relies* on" or "*Writes* to." This feature required teachers to observe whether a student could actually perform a specific reading/writing skill. Most of the time, teachers had to use their classroom observational data to mark the skills listed on the rubrics or report cards. For example, "Silent reads for longer periods (at least 20 minutes)" (Reading Attitude at the Expanding (grade 2) level), would require a teacher to do so.

Ms. Carter and Ms. Ford emphasized the decision of specifying student proficiency levels on the report card. Ms. Carter appeared to adopt a deductive approach when using the rubric to conclude a proficiency level on the report card. Ms. Carter usually commented on student performance with reference to a specific proficiency level and then compared student performance against the rubric. Ms. Ford, on the other hand,

used an inductive approach. Ms. Ford compared student performance against the rubric first and then, and then based on the mark on the rubric, she concluded a grade on the report card.

It should be noted that the District did not provide a 'script' for teachers to question students during the interview. It was up to individual teachers to decide what and when to ask and what and when to observe so that they could collect data for specific assessment items listed in the rubrics. Ms. Carter, Ford, and Nixon tended to ask for factual information. Ms. Reagan followed a story-retelling sheet and asked questions about story elements (setting, characters, problem, and solution) to check comprehension.

Formally, the District only requested rubrics be sent to the District and report cards to parents. All four teachers did more than what was required. They worked out their own record-keeping system in their class and/or during the interview assessment so that their grading was all based on some documentation and/or evidence. Yet, I often heard teachers express concern about the paper work for the assessment program, especially when they had to cross-reference documents, such as their own notes, reading logs, writing samples, rubrics, audio tapes, and report cards. They often expressed great relief when report cards were finally sent out.

To conclude, the integration of classroom observation, pullout interviews, genuine writing samples, and rubrics seemed to provide detailed information of student learning on reading and writing. Overall, all four teachers internalized the evaluative rubrics and were interested in discovering whether the skills listed on the rubric were observed in the classroom and/or interview. Information obtained from the assessment was mainly details of student attainment on the district assessment outcomes and student proficiency

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

status on the evaluative rubrics, which included reading/writing skills, processes, and attitudes.

Use of Assessment Results

(Research Question #3: How did the teachers use the assessment results? To what extent did the District use the assessment results for accountability purposes? To what extent did teachers use the assessment results for instructional purposes?)

The District never stated that assessment results would be used to hold teachers, principals, and/or schools accountable for student learning or achievement. The marked rubrics were sent to the District Research Office twice a year. The marking of student attainment on each item on the rubrics were saved in computer. Yet, during my visit in 'Washington' School, there was no evidence of any personnel changes because of the marked rubrics sent to the District.

The District hoped teachers would treat the K-2 Performance Assessment Program as their own personal tool and use the assessment results to help monitor student learning and close up achievement gaps. The marked assessment rubrics clearly provided detailed information of each student's learning status. Yet, the availability of the assessment results does not guarantee that teachers would use the results to adjust their teaching methods and/or strategies. The District certainly hoped that assessment did not end at data collection (to be sent to the District or parents), but that results would be used in making pedagogical decisions.

Clarification

The term 'assessment results' as used here means both the *marked/documented* assessment items AND the *general impression* which teachers obtained from the assessments. Marked/documented assessment items were the outcomes that teachers marked on the rubrics as well as the proficiency level and comments that teacher concluded on the report card. The general impression teachers obtained from assessments is observations like difficulty that a student experienced when reading certain texts (e.g., because of limited exposure of Western cultural or literature). In the present study teachers were often asked how they graded their students, while it was possible that teachers did not obtain the information/impression from a specific assessment (e.g., interview) but from their classroom observation. Teachers' comments immediately after an assessment and their classroom behavior were traced to conclude their uses of the assessment results (or 'information/impression' obtained from the assessment).

Uses

Major uses of the assessment results (including general information and impression) are discussed as follows:

Encouraging students. Teachers usually did not wait until an assessment was over to use the assessment results on students. Even during the interview assessment, Ms. Carter and Ms. Reagan encouraged students. They often showed students the evidence of their progress that could be seen in the records. Ms. Carter told students the specific books that they could read at the beginning of the year (according to the reading log) and

the books that they could read later. Ms. Reagan showed students their recording of reading and asked students to judge whether they improved.

Providing learning programs/activities. Ms. Carter did not limit her use of the assessment results on struggling students. Based on the assessment results, Ms. Carter invited outside experts to develop enrichment programs for gifted students. When Ms. Reagan discovered that even her most advanced readers could not articulate the main problem of their story, Ms. Reagan indicated to me that she would give her students more practice on reading comprehension in class.

Ms. Nixon indicated that the assessment results helped her use her parent volunteers in her classroom effectively. Based on the assessment results, Ms. Nixon usually asked certain parents to play games with small groups of students to reinforce the skills that the students did not pass (i.e., did not reach the grade-level outcome standards).

Evaluating teaching effectiveness and deciding teaching content. Ms. Nixon used the assessment results to evaluate her own teaching effectiveness and to decide teaching content. Ms. Nixon said that when 98% of her students reached a goal (e.g., sounding out a specific letter), Ms. Nixon would grade her own teaching as effective and would move on to the next curricular topic (e.g., teaching another letter and sound). When Ms. Nixon finished teaching the kindergarten curriculum one month before the school was over, Ms. Nixon indicated to me that, based on her satisfactory assessment results, she decided to move on to teach the first-grade content.

Obtaining base line data for re-assessments. Ms. Ford and Ms. Nixon obtained base line data around two to three weeks before the report card was due. This was for these teachers to provide interventions so that the students would be closer to the goal

when teachers conducted the assessment the next time. For example, based on the assessment results, Ms. Nixon provided group activities to improve learning on this subject. Ms. Nixon then re-assessed the students, and only focused on the letter and/or sounds that the students missed the last time.

Seeking parental assistance. All four teachers felt that the assessment provided concrete evidence of student learning and non-learning, which helped teachers communicate with parents to address the issue that parental assistance at home was crucial. Ms. Nixon usually provided some ideas and/or game packages for parents to play with their child at home, for example, to improve the student's skills in sounding out letters. Ms. Reagan believes that the assessment results help parents understand the district standards and the status of their child's performance against the standards.

Considering retention. Ms. Nixon used the grade-level standards as her criteria to consider whether to retain a student. Ms. Nixon would consider retention if students did not reach the kindergarten level of performance standards. If a student passed the district grade-level standard but did not reach Ms. Nixon's personal goal (higher than the district standards), then Ms. Nixon would discuss with the parents the possibility of retention. It was Ms. Nixon's personal (not the District's) decision to use the assessment results when she considered retention.

Assigning reading material at home. Ms. Carter often told a student to take the book that s/he had difficulty reading (during the reading assessment) and practice at home. Similarly, at the end of the interview assessment for the last report card (June 1998), Ms. Reagan asked an ESL student to read a variety of Western literature in the

summer to increase his exposure to Western culture and to improve his English reading comprehension.

Conducting remedial teaching. I often observed teachers conduct remedial teaching during interview assessments. It seemed that at some point of the assessment the teachers decided to use the assessment results (or impression) they obtained to provide immediate interventions.

Concerns

Use of the assessment results could be limited. The results could not be used to diagnose student reading/writing problem(s). It seemed that the teacher could only tell whether a student possessed or lacked a certain reading/writing skills, but could not tell what the learning problems were. For example, when a student read with hesitation, the teacher could not tell whether the student had language development difficulty, cognitive deficiency, or reading problems.

In fact, the District admitted that the K-2 performance assessment program was not for diagnostic purposes. The District encouraged teachers to use other assessment programs to diagnose learning problems on reading and writing. This was what Ms. Reagan did on one occasion. When Ms. Reagan sensed that a student had difficulty reading and did not seem to make much progress over time on the assessments, Ms. Reagan conducted an additional test on the student. When the test still did not indicate what the problem was, Ms. Reagan referred the student to a reading specialist.

Theoretically, the assessment results were intended to inform the next year's teachers about student learning status so that teachers could individualize their

interactions. Unfortunately, the extent to which teachers who received the assessment results used the information was not clear. Ms. Ford and Ms. Reagan read all of their students' marked rubrics to find out what the students learned in the previous year. Yet, they still asked students to read to them at the beginning of the year when they placed students in reading groups.

It was also not clear what the fate of the assessment results would be after the students passed the second grade. Ms. Reagan mentioned that none of the third-grade teachers came to ask her for the second-grade assessment results. Thus, use of the assessment results after the second grade did not seem to exist.

To conclude, teachers mainly used the assessment results to help struggling students. For example, teachers obtained baseline data to schedule interventions and re-assessments, and they used the assessment results as evidence to seek parental assistance at home, to consider grouping to reinforce target skills, to assign reading material at home, and to conduct remedial teaching during the interview assessments. Teachers also used the assessment results to encourage students and to consider enrichment activities. Nonetheless, the scope and depth was not as much as the interventions provided to struggling students. Generally speaking, the assessment results had only a subtle effect on teaching, for example, considering re-teaching on some topics (all four teachers) and teaching content (Ms. Nixon).

Educational Implications

The findings discussed above are now compared with related literature on performance assessment reviewed in the first and second chapters.

Assessment Design

The design of the performance assessment program in the present study is strongly theory-grounded. Specifically, the present K-2 performance assessment program was designed to evaluate student performance through the combination of student-constructed responses and collection of student work (Elliott, 1994). Teachers were expected to take a longitudinal approach when they collected assessment data based on multiple measures (Herman et al, 1992).

Furthermore, teachers did not have control over assessment design except scoring, data gathering, and evaluation as in the Work Sampling System (Dorfman, 1997), Early Literacy Portfolio (Salinger, 1998), and Primary Language Record (Khattri et al., 1998). the evaluative rubric in the present study is similar to the "Emergent Literacy Scale" in the Early Literacy Portfolio (note: "Early/Advanced Emergent" as kindergarten standards, "Early/Advanced Beginning" as the first grade standards, and "Early/Advanced Independent" as the second grade standards) (Salinger, 1998).

It appeared that the District in this study intended to integrate the assessment *methods/technique* into daily evaluative practices for assessment purposes (to fill out the report card). The District did not emphasize integration of the assessment *tasks* into classroom learning activities.

According to Khattri et al. (1998), there are two ways of integrating the performance assessment into classroom instruction. One way of integration is to use the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics as instructional activities. For example, a teacher turns an assessment task into a classroom activity, and explains the goal and evaluative standards of the activity (i.e., an assessment task) to the class. Upon completion, the teacher then evaluates the student performance based on the scoring rubric.

The other way to integrate is using the assessment solely for an evaluation purpose (Khattri et al., 1998, pp. 45-47). When a teacher integrates an assessment *method* into daily teaching practices, s/he takes notes of student reading, writing, and/or speaking behavior on a regular basis, and based on the information obtained, makes instructional decisions.

In the present study, teachers were prompted to keep track of and concentrate on individual student learning to adjust their teaching content and pace. That is, teachers were only expected to integrate assessment *methods* into their teaching.

Nonetheless, this study suggests that integrating assessment methods into teaching may not cause teachers to directly teach to higher order skills and processes as Gipps (1994) and L. B. Resnick (1987) advocate. Teachers may need to integrate assessment tasks into classroom learning activities to foster student effort in dealing with complexity.

The expected effects of the performance assessment program on teaching are also theoretically grounded. For example, the purpose of the performance assessment program in the present study is mainly to "monitor student achievement toward desired outcomes" and to "guide changes in instruction and curriculum," rather than to "hold school accountable" (Khattre, et al, 1995). That is, the program was intended to be

pedagogically useful. Teachers were given full control over data collection, evaluation, and documentation processes, which is similar to the Work Sampling System (Meisels, 1993), the Early Literacy Portfolio (Salinger, 1998), and Primary Language Records (Falk, 1994). According to Khattri et al. (1998), the more teachers can control the assessment practices and are engaged in data collection on a regular basis, the more likely the performance assessment can inform and affect teaching.

Scoring and Marking

Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) question the usefulness of a holistic score obtained from performance assessments on the improvement of student learning. These authors then suggest a 'dimensional scoring system' and mix of learning outcomes across proficiency levels. The present study supports the suggestion. The three dimensions, "Comprehension," "Work Identification," and "Attitude" listed in the reading rubrics in the present study seemed to orient teachers' evaluation of student performance on these three aspects; and the flexibility to mark on more than one proficiency level seemed to free teachers from the pressure of deciding a proficiency level that fits ALL attributes of a specific level.

Furthermore, flexible marking across proficiency levels seemed to encourage teachers to check on a spectrum of learning outcomes. Eventually, teachers might take an inductive or deductive approach when they need to make a conclusion on proficiency levels. In this case, it seemed that cross-referenced information which includes a proficiency level and a set of learning outcomes makes the assessment results more informative.

However, Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) warn that dimensional scoring may result in teacher tendency "to look for the particular weakness" (p. 34). The present study indicates otherwise. Teachers seemed to be able to identify the strong features of reading and writing skills that struggling students demonstrated and teachers seemed to increase their expectation on those students.

Information Gained

Borko et al. (1993) report that by listening to students read and asking them questions, teachers gained information about students' level of understanding, reading skills, and whether students enjoyed reading. In the present study, teachers gained rubric-specific information—teachers compared student performance against a set of outcome attainments and transformed their evaluation into an outcome item listed in the rubric.

This finding is different from what was reported by a kindergarten teacher ("Sue") in the Work Sampling System (Dorfman, 1997). "Sue," complained that the information she obtained was too general and she was not informed about "which letters the children recognized, how far they could count, what colors they knew, and other discrete skills" (pp. 158-9; as quoted in Chapter Four).

More significantly, as mentioned in Chapter Five, information gained from rubrics seemed to keep teachers concentrating on individual student performance. Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) expressed concern that standards are not useful reference points for assessing performance because teachers will still think about grouping student into high, middle, and low levels. This present study shows otherwise. I observed teachers spend time checking learning outcomes listed on rubrics, making

conclusions on proficiency levels and overall comments based on the evidence they collected from individual students, instead of ranking them.

Direct Questioning Technique

In the present study, rubrics clearly worked as conceptual frameworks to orient teachers on their data collection and evaluation processes as suggested by Dorfman (1997), Khattri et al. (1998), and Falk (1994). Teachers were observed collecting data from multiple sources and grounding their evaluation in pieces of learning evidence as was reported in Falk (1998).

Nonetheless, information gained from rubrics may not inform teachers about student higher order thinking processes as Resnick and Resnick (1996) expect. The present study suggests that teachers use direct questioning technique as was used in Herman et al. (1992) to obtain diagnostic information about student learning. I believe this procedure will help teachers understand what is happening inside a learner's head so that real learning problems can be diagnosed. Otherwise, when only observable responses and/or behavior are examined, the conclusion made about students is limited. The conclusion can, at best, portray (or keep track of) student learning status, and may not help teachers solve student learning problems.

Impact on Instruction

Collection of information from rubrics may not ensure that teachers tailor their instructional strategies to match individual student learning needs as suggested by Marzano (1995) and Gullo (1994). In the present study, teachers tended to use the

assessment results to keep track of student performance, to reinforce target skills, and to communicate with parents (instead of colleagues). Teachers seemed to be sensible about student performance but did not respond to it through a wide range of pedagogical strategies. The present study strongly suggests that districts provide teachers with resources to improve their knowledge and experience in interpreting assessment results and in developing corresponding work plans.

Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) suggest that the more teachers are involved in rubric development and discussions about work evaluation, the more likely teachers would view the information obtained from the assessment as instructionally important. The present study on this regard is not conclusive. First of all, peer discussion on assessment practices did not voluntarily happen. Secondly, there seemed to be a gap between the information obtained from the assessment (featured with a set of reading/writing skills, processes, and attitudes) and pedagogical decisions.

It is not certain whether teacher involvement in rubric development or assessment practices as suggested by Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) would make the assessment results more instructionally useful. It seems to be crucial that district should provide resources to help teachers on their knowledge and experiences in interpreting assessment results and on broad considerations of instructional strategies and methods. This professional development may be equivalent to what Dorfman (1997) describes as "broad knowledge of curriculum, extensive repertories of instructional strategies, and deep understandings of learners and learning" (p. 4), which Dorfman believes will make a performance assessment become more informatively useful (see also Darling-Hammond, & Ancess,1996; and Wolf & Reardon, 1996).

Furthermore, Khattri et al. (1998) hypothesize that when a performance assessment is newly developed to align with instructional reforms through on-demand tasks with limited integration into instruction, the impact of the performance assessment on teaching is limited. On the other hand, when teachers were experienced with assessment methods, integrated the assessment into their instruction, and mainly counted on portfolio and extended performance tasks to collect data, these teachers tended to be able to use the assessment results to reform teaching and learning. The present study suggests that these factors (such as assessment purposes, teacher experiences on assessment, task types, and integration) can only affect the quality and quantity of data collected. I believe it is teacher knowledge and experiences on interpreting the assessment results that bridge the gap between data and use of data and eventually increase the impact of assessment results on teaching.

Research Implications

It seems that information obtained from rubrics can be very checklist like and its effect on instruction can be very limited, especially when the assessments are conducted in a brief fashion. We need to know the extent to which direct questioning helps teachers explore thinking processes, interpret what they observe, and enrich their learning about student needs. A research initiative will be for teachers to ask why-questions to students to explain their reasons of responses.

We also need to understand the relationship between in-service on improvement of teachers knowledge on curriculum and instructional strategies and use of assessment

results on teaching. For example, when repertories of pedagogical strategies are introduced, does the assessment create more impact on instruction than otherwise?

Further exploration of student involvement in self-evaluation in K-2 performance assessments is also necessary. We need to know what techniques and resources are available, the extent to which this procedure is workable in lower grades, and how this procedure helps teachers understand their students better. We need to know the extent to which the information obtained from observation and interviews differs from the information obtained from student self-assessments, and how student self-evaluation affects teacher interpretation and use of the assessment results.

When performance assessments are used only in lower grader (e.g., K-2), we need to know the extent to which the information obtained is useful in higher grades, especially when a standardized (non-performance based) test system is installed. Do teachers of higher grades appreciate the information? How do they use the information, and how will the information affect their instructions and testing practices?

In the present study, the District empowered teachers instead of holding teachers accountable for student learning performance. It seems that under this open system, teachers appreciated the trust and responded with professional judgment and practices to ensure the trustworthiness of the assessment results. It will be interesting to extend this research project to document whether this "imbalance" of power maintains after a few years, especially when the political situation changes in the district. It should also be interesting to know whether this "imbalance" can be maintained in low performing schools.

Limitations of the Study

There are some structural limitations to the present study. That is, the study could only explore what existed and could not explain much about "what-if" questions. For example, the study could not address the effect of direct questioning on teacher' collection and interpretation of assessment data. The study could not explain what would happen when students were involved in portfolio assessments and evaluating their own performance. The study could not state for certain whether the conclusion will hold true when the assessment subject is mathematics and/or in higher grades (i.e., third and higher).

There are also some methodological limitations in the present study. For example, I asked teachers to articulate the information that they obtained when they conducted interview assessments, when they graded writing, and when they checked the assessment items on the rubrics and report cards. Yet, teachers might not have (or could not) fully disclosed the information that they obtained or I simply overlooked what they intended to say. In addition, I observed regular classroom routines and teacher-student interactions, and I interviewed teachers as often as possible to inquire information about teacher use of assessment results on classroom teaching. Yet, my time in the classroom was limited and teachers might have applied assessment results to their decisions in such a subtle way that the data was not captured in my observation or interviews. This is why I cited my data source in Chapter Five where most of my data featured, and I conducted serious member checking to ensure the trustworthiness of the present study.

Closing Thoughts

Given the grand scope of the present study, a summarization of my findings and implications for readers seems appropriate:

- The theory-grounded teacher-empowered K-2 performance assessment program accompanied with the District's low level of interference in local classrooms interacted very well with teachers' high ethical standards on assessments.
- When in-service was voluntary, teachers did not spontaneously practice comprehensive portfolio or student self assessment in their classroom but mainly relied on observation and interviews; discussion among teachers on assessment practices was also limited because of time constraints.
- Rubrics worked as conceptual frameworks for data collection and evaluation (Dorfman, 1997, Khattri et al. , 1998, and Falk, 1994) and teachers usually grounded their evaluation on evidence as claimed by Falk (1998).
- Dimensional scoring and flexible marking across proficiency levels were implemented to make assessment results informative, which did not lead teachers to focus on student weakness as warned by Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998); in fact, teachers appeared to focus on strength.
- Information obtained from the K-2 Performance Assessment Program was criteria-referenced and individualized. Teachers did not use a normative language (as Pearson, DeStefano, and García (1998) concerned) when commenting on student performance. In-service on direct questioning

technique is strongly recommended (Resnick and Resnick, 1996) to explore student higher-order thinking processes and to diagnose learning problems.

- Assessment results were mainly for remedial uses because of a gap between assessment results and corresponding pedagogical strategies. It is recommended that performance assessment programs should be accompanied with extensive repertories of instructional strategies (Darling-Hammond & Ancess, 1996; and Wolf & Reardon, 1996). It was not conclusive that teacher involvement in rubric development and peer discussion (Pearson, DeStefano, and García, 1998) and teacher experiences on assessments, task types, and integration (Khattri et al. 1998) would make assessments more informative.
- Further study on low-performing schools is recommended as well as on impact of assessment results on teaching, when in-service on direct questioning, portfolio, student self-assessments, and/or repertories of pedagogy are provided.

REFERENCES

Adams Public Schools (1995/6). Primary performance assessment handbook: K-2. AA Public Schools.

Afflerbach P. P., Almasi J. F., Guthrie, J. T., & Schafer, W. D. (1996). Barriers to the implementation of a statewide performance program: School personnel perspectives. Reading Research Report No. 51. National Reading Research Center, Universities of Georgia and Maryland.
ED 392 020.

Barr, M., Ellis, S., Hester, H., & Thomas A. (1988). The primary language record. London: ILEA/Centre for Language in Primary Education.

Barr, M., & Cheong, J. (1993). Achieving equity; Counting on the classroom. Paper presented on 12 March 1993 at a symposium held in Washington DC on 'Equity and Educational Testing and Assessment', sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

Barr, M., & Syverson, M. (1994). Overview of the California Learning Record: Report on regional moderation reading. La Jolla, CA: The Center for Language in Learning.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Borko, H., Flory, M., & Cumbo, K. (1993). Teachers' ideas and practices about assessment and instruction: A case study of the effects of alternative assessment in instruction, student learning and accountability practices. National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. ED 378 226.

Brookhart, S. (1993). Teachers' grading practices. Journal of Educational Measurement, 30 (2).

Center for Language in Learning. (1990). The reading book. London: ILEA

Centre for Language in Learning. (1995). Language matters, No. 2/3. London.

Clay, M. M. (1979). Reading: The patterning of complex behaviour. Portfsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. M. (1985). The early detection of reading difficulties, 3rd edn, Auckland, NZ: Heinemann.

Clift, P., Weiner, G., & Wilson, E. (1981). Record keeping in primary schools. London: Macmillan Educational Books/Schools council.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ancess, J. (1996). Authentic assessment and school development. In J. B. Baron & D. P. Wolf (Eds.), Performance-based student assessment: Challenges and possibilities (95th Yearbook of the Society for the Study of Education, pp. 52-83). Chicago, IL: Society for the Study of Education.

Day, V. P. (1996). Linking performance assessment and curricular goals. Teaching Exceptional Children, 29(1), 59-64.

Dorfman, A. B. (1997). Performance assessment and teacher professional development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Michigan.

Elliott, S. N. (1994). Creating meaningful performance assessments: Fundamental concepts. Reton, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. ED 375 566.

Falk, B. (1994). How assessment supports teaching and learning: A look at the Primary Language Record. The Educational Forum, 59, 30-38.

Falk, B. (1995). Authentic assessment as a catalyst for learning: An inquiry model of professional development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Falk, B. (1998). How direct evidence to assess student progress: How the Primary Language Record supports teaching and learning. In C. Harrison & T. Salinger (Eds.), Assessment reading I: Theory and practice (pp. 152-165). New York, NY: Routledge.

Falk, B., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). The Primary Language Record at P.S. 261: How assessment transforms teaching and learning. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education Schools and Teaching.

Falk, B., McMurdy, S., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Taking a different look: How the Primary Language Record supports teaching for diverse learners. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education School and Teaching.

Feeney, K., & Hann, P. (1991). Survey of reading performance in year 2: Summer 1991. London: Lewisham Education.

Flexer, R. J., & Gerstner, E. A. (1993). Dilemmas and issues for teachers developing performance assessments in mathematics. A case study of the effects of alternative assessment in instruction, student learning and accountability practices. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 224)

Flexer, R. F., Cumbo, K, Borko, H, Mayfield V., & Marion S. F. (1995). How "messing about" with performance assessment in mathematics affects what happens in classroom (Report No. CSE-TR-396). Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 389 735)

Frederiksen, J., & Collins, A. (1989). A systems approach to educational testing. Educational Researcher, 18(9), 27-32.

García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Assessment and diversity. Review of Research in Education, 20, 337-391.

Gipps, C. V. (1994). Beyond testing: Toward a theory of educational assessment. London: The Falmer Press.

Gipps, C., Brown, M., McCallum, B., & McAlister, S. (1995). Intuition or evidence? Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Gipps, C. V., McCallum, B., McAlister, S. & Brown, M. (1992). National assessment at seven: Some emerging themes. In Gipps, C. (Ed.), Developing assessment for the national curriculum. London, Bedford Way Series, ULIE/Kogan Page.

Gipps, C. V., Steadman, S., Goldstein, H., & Stierer, B. (1983). Testing Children: Standardized testing in schools and LEAs. London: Heinemann Educational.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Gomez, M. L., Graue, M. E., & Bloch, M. N. (1991). Reassessing portfolio assessment: Rhetoric and reality. Language Arts, 68: 620-8.

Gullo, D. F. (1994). Understanding assessment and evaluation in early childhood education. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Herman, J. L., Aschbacher, P. R., & Winters, L. (1992). A practical guide to alternative assessment. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hoffman, J., Roser, N., & Worthy, J. (1998). Challenging the assessment context for literacy instruction in first grade: a collaborative study. In C. Harrison & T. Salinger (Eds.), Assessment reading I: Theory and practice (pp. 166-181). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jones, J. & Chittenden, E. (in press). Teachers' perceptions of rating an early literacy portfolio. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service Center for Performance Assessment.

Kane, M. B., & Mitchell, R. (Eds.). (1996). Implementing performance assessment: Promises, problems, and challenges. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Khattri, N, Reeve, A. L., & Kane, M. B. (1998). Principles and practices of performance assessment. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Khattri, N., Reeve, A. L., Kane, M. B., & Adamson, R. (1995). Studies of education reform: Assessment of student performance. Washington, DC: Pelavin Research Inst. ED 397 532, ED 397 533 & ED 397 534.

Khattri, N., & Sweet D. (1996). Assessment reform: Promises and challenges. In M. B. Kane & R. Mitchell (Eds.), Implementing performance assessment: Promises, problems, and challenges (pp. 1-21). Mahawah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Koretz, D., Stecher, B., & Diebert, E. (1992). The Vermont portfolio assessment program: Interim report. CRESST, Ferbuary.

Lamme, L. L., & Hysmith, C. (1991). One school's adventure into portfolio assessment. Language Arts, 68: 629-40.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mabry, L. (1992, December). Twenty years of alternative assessment at a Wisconsin high school. The School Administrator, pp. 12-13.

Marzano, R. J. (1995). Lessons from the field about outcome-based performance assessments. Educational leadership, 52(5), 44-50.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1991). Test-based accountability as a reform strategy. Phi Delta Kappan 73: 248-251.

Mehrens, W. (1992). Using performance assessment for accountability purposes. Educational measurement: Issues and practice, spring, 3-20.

Meisels, S. J. (1993). Remaking classroom assessment with the work sampling system. Young Children, 48(5), 34-40.

Miserlis, S. (1993). The classroom as an anthropological dig: Using the California Learning Record (CLR) as a framework for assessment and instruction. Unpublished paper.

Mitchell, R. (1992). Testing for learning: How new approaches to evaluation can improve American schools. New York: Free Press.

National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE). (1997a). National center products - New Standards™ Student Performance Standards. Washington, DC: Author.

National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE). (1997b). For our children: A parent's guide to new standards. Washington, DC: Author.

National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE). (1997c). New Standards: Performance standards and assessment for the schools. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council on Education Standards and Testing (1992). Raising standards for American education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. ED 338 721.

Navarrete C., & Gustke, C. (1996). A guide to performance assessment for linguistically diverse students. Washington, DC: NCBE publication.

O'Sullivan, O. (1995). The Primary Language Record *in use*. London: Centre for Language in Primary Education.

Pearson, P. D. & DeStefano, L. (1993). An evaluation of the 1992 NAEP reading achievement levels, report three: Comparison of the cutpoints for the 1992 NAEP Reading Achievement Levels with those set by alternate means. In Setting Performance Standards for Student Achievement: Background Studies. Stanford CA: The National Academy of Education.

Pearson, P. D., DeStefano, L., & García, G. E. (1998). Ten dilemmas of performance assessments. In C. Harrison & T. Salinger (Eds.), Assessing reading 1: Theory and Practice. New York: Routledge.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc.

Payne, D. A. (1997). Applied Educational Assessment. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company.

Pelavin Associates and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (1991). Performance assessments in the states. Washington, DC: Author.

Resnick D. P., & Resnick, L. B. (1996). Performance assessment and the multiple functions of educational measurement. In M. B. Kane & R. Mitchell (Eds.), Implementing performance assessment: Promises, problems, and challenges. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Resnick, L. B. (1987). Education and learning to think. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Resnick, L. B., & Simmons, W. (1993). Assessment as the catalyst of school reform. Educational Leadership, 50(5), 11-15.

Rudner L. M., & Boston C. (1994). Performance assessment. The ERIC Review, 3 (1).

Salinger, T. (1995). In England they call it "backwash": consequential validity of an early literacy portfolio. Presentation, University of Delaware Colloquium Series.

Salinger, T. (1998). Consequential validity of an early literacy portfolio: the 'backwash' of reform. In C. Harrison & T. Salinger (Eds.), Assessing reading 1: Theory and Practice. New York: Routledge.

Smith, M. L., & Cohen, M. (1991). A national curriculum in the United States? *Educational Leadership, 49*(1), 74-81.

State Department of Education. (1998). School district data book. Author.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). Qualitative analysis for social scientists. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc.

U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment. (1992). Testing in American schools: Asking the right questions. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Valencia, S. W., Hiebert, E. H., & Afflerbach, P. P. (1994). Authentic reading assessment: Practices and possibilities. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary. (1986). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Weiss, B. (1994). California's new English-language arts assessment. In S. W. Valencia, En H. Hiebert, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), Authentic reading assessment: Practices and possibilities. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Wilson, M., & Adams, R. (1992). Evaluating progress with alternative assessments: A model for Chapter I. Unpublished paper.

Wolf, D. P., & Reardon, S. (1996). Access to excellence through new forms of student assessment. In J. B. Baron & D. P. Wolf (Eds.), Performance-based student assessment: Challenges and possibilities (95th Yearbook of the Society for the Study of Education, pp. 1-31). Chicago, IL: Society for the Study of Education.

APPENDIX A

"ADAMS" PUBLIC SCHOOLS STUDENT OUTCOMES

KINDERGARTEN

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS READING OUTCOMES

	Kindergarten English Language Arts Reading Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
COMPREHENSION	• Listens to a variety of kinds of books and stories (both fiction and nonfiction). • Explains the differences between stories and informational books. • Recognizes that authors write text and illustrators make pictures. • Engages in shared reading experiences with whole class and in small groups. • Sets purpose for reading before a shared reading experience e.g., to find out about _____, for entertainment. • Previews books before being read to or before a shared reading in whole class and small groups. • Practices predicting before and during a story that is read to them. • Recalls prior knowledge and personal experiences related to topic. • Organizes information and discovers related ideas e.g., story maps, Venn diagrams, charts.	• Demonstrates knowledge of books and print. • Recognizes most letters of the alphabet. • Responds to what is heard or read e.g., listens intently, joins in familiar stories, draws pictures. • Uses picture clues to construct meaning of an unfamiliar story.
NARRATIVE:	• Retells a picture book story naming the main character(s) and some of the events. • Responds to questions which focus on story line and go beyond the text e.g., "What happened to the (main character) when_____?" "Why do you think the (main character) did that?" "Has anything like this ever happened to you?" • Compares/contrasts stories, characters, different versions of the same story, books by the same author, settings. • Distinguishes whether a story is realistic or fantasy (make believe/pretend) using evidence from the story.	• Demonstrates knowledge of story structure: setting, characters and events. • Recognizes author's pattern in stories.
STUDY SKILLS	• Recognizes a dictionary and its uses. • Recognizes/uses graphic aids: - illustrations - graphs	• Recognizes text features i.e., illustrations, title, author's name, illustrator's name.
WORD IDENTIFICATION	• Recognizes some sight words i.e., identifies familiar words in other contexts. • Reproduces sounds that letters make. • Uses context of sentence, paragraph or story to identify an unknown word in a selection read by the teacher.	• Identifies words/logos within the classroom and outside of school.
WORD MEANING	• Uses context of sentence, paragraph or story to determine the meaning of an unknown word in a selection read by the teacher.	
ATTITUDE		• Exhibits positive attitude toward reading.

* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KINDERGARTEN

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS OUTCOMES

	Kindergarten English Language Arts Writing Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
PROCESS		
PREWRITING:	• Participates in prewriting experiences: discussing with a partner; orally listing. • Creates and communicates orally his/her own stories.	
DRAFTING	• Uses computer for writing. • Writes independently and participates in whole class and small group writing experiences.	• Writes independently to convey meaning.
REVISING	• Shares writing with peers and others.	• Reads his/her own writing.
PUBLISHING	• Publishes at least 2-3 writing pieces during the year, based on whole class writing activities.	
PRODUCT		
CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION	• Writes for different purposes e.g., writing notes for friends and family, making lists, making signs. • Uses a variety of writing forms: - personal narratives - descriptions - explanations	
CONVENTIONS	• Uses knowledge of letter sounds to write words.	• Reproduces (by copying) most letters of the alphabet. • Reproduces first name by memory and last name by copying.
ATTITUDE	• Seeks out opportunities to write, independent of teacher direction.	• Exhibits a positive attitude toward own writing.

MATHEMATICAL THINKING

	Mathematical Thinking	
	Focus on Development & Growth * (In all grades, K - 5)	Focus on Attainment ** (By end of Grade 5)
MATHEMATICAL PROBLEM SOLVING	• (See problem solving and logic strand by grade level.) • Work with others to solve problems.	• Formulate and solve problems in both group and individual settings.
MATHEMATICAL COMMUNICATION	• Model situations using oral, written, concrete, pictorial, graphical and algebraic methods. • Develop and use the language of mathematics, reflecting on and clarifying their own thinking about mathematical language and symbols. • Relate everyday language to mathematical language and symbols. • Represent and describe mathematical relationships.	• Communicate mathematically.

* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KINDERGARTEN

	Kindergarten Science Outcomes # refers to lesson number in respective units Explorations Through the Seasons (ES), Pets(PE), Senses(SE)	
	Ann Arbor Elementary Science Program Outcome #2 Recognize ways science, math interact with technology, humanities.	
	5 Construct charts, graphs and prepare summaries of observations.	5 Chart pet needs. PE # 4 5 Graph kinds of pets. PE # 1 5 Graph kinds of nuts. ES # 5 5 Record tastes on tongue map. SE # 7
	Ann Arbor Elementary Science Program Outcome #3 : Use key contemporary concepts in Life, Physical and Earth Science, use principles of science and demonstrate properties of the natural world, recognizing its diversity and unity.	
LIFE SCIENCE	9 Describe the basic requirements for all living things to maintain their existence.	9 Explain how pet care objects are used for pet needs. PE # 5
	12 Compare and classify familiar organisms on the basis of observable characteristics.	12 Describe reptile characteristics. PE #1 12 Compare anoles with reptiles based on characteristics. PE # 2
PHYSICAL SCIENCE	13 Classify sounds in terms of their properties (pitch, volume).	13 Match sounds made by objects in film canisters. SE # 1, 2, 11
EARTH SCIENCE	23 Describe seasonal changes in the earth's surface.	23 Participate in seasonal activities. ES #s 1-12 23 Explain why squirrels must gather food for winter. ES # 5 23 Describe changes in puddles after a spring rain. ES #12 23 Sequence changes in a tree through the seasons. ES # 2

	Kindergarten Social Studies Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
CITIZENSHIP/ GOVERNMENT/LAW	• Describe why rules are needed. • Describe consequences that may occur if rules are not followed.	• Explain the rights and responsibilities people have as a member of a family and a class.
HISTORY	• Sequence events in the history of own life. • Compare ways we do things with the way things were done long ago (using stories for examples). • Describe ways a person could help/contribute in the classroom.	• Explain how children change over time. • Explain how children stay the same over time. • Describe how children lived and did things in another time. • Relate the importance of individuals and groups who have made a difference.
HUMAN BEHAVIOR	• Explain ways a person can be a good group member.	• Describe how children live and do things in another country. • Explain ways children are the same and ways that children are different. • Explain ways in which children work independently and cooperatively to accomplish goals. • Demonstrate sensitivity toward and respect for others.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIRST GRADE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS READING OUTCOMES

	First Grade English Language Arts Reading Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
COMPREHENSION	• Listens to a variety of kinds of books and stories (both fiction and nonfiction). *(Kindergarten*)* • Uses the strategies of previewing, predicting and identifying background knowledge with a variety of narrative and informational materials. • States that the purpose of reading is to build the meaning of what you are reading, not just recognizing the words. • States that authors have different purposes for writing e.g., to entertain, to persuade, to inform. • Sets purpose for reading. *(Kindergarten*)* • Recalls prior knowledge and personal experiences related to topic. *(Kindergarten*)* • Uses background knowledge and information from a text (at student's independent reading level) to make inferences before and during reading. • Uses syntactic cues to construct meaning e.g., sentence structure, punctuation. • Organizes information and discovers related ideas e.g., KWL, story maps, Venn diagrams. *(Kindergarten*)*	• Chooses and reads books independently. • Responds to what is heard or read e.g., draws pictures, writes, discusses. *(Kindergarten*)* • Recognizes that authors write text and illustrators make pictures. *(Kindergarten*)*
NARRATIVE:	• Retells orally a short story he/she has read, including the story elements. • Responds to questions which focus on story line and go beyond the text e.g., "Why do you think the (main character) did that?" "What did the (character) do when_____?" "Has anything like this ever happened to you?" *(Kindergarten*)* • Compares/contrasts stories, characters, different versions of the same story, books by the same author, settings. *(Kindergarten*)* • Identifies the unique characteristics of a variety of story forms e.g., fairy tales, folktales, fables.	• Retells orally a "↔ picture book" story read to him/her, including the story elements. • Uses picture clues and words to construct meaning of an unfamiliar story, read by student. • Distinguishes whether a story is realistic or fantasy (make believe/pretend) using evidence from the story. *(Kindergarten*)* • Recognizes author's pattern in stories. *(Kindergarten*)*
INFORMATIONAL	• Identifies the unique characteristics of informational books and articles. • Identifies topic and two supporting details of an informational book read to him/her. • Retells orally an informational passage.	• Explains the differences between stories and informational books. *(Kindergarten*)*
STUDY SKILLS	• Recognizes/interprets graphic aids: - charts - maps - tables - globes • Uses reference materials: - dictionary	• Recognizes/interprets graphic aids: - illustrations (Kindergarten*) - graphs (Kindergarten*) • Recognizes text features i.e., illustrations, title, title page, author's name, illustrator's name, dedication, table of contents. *(Kindergarten*)*
FLUENCY	• Reads 70-100 books by the end of the year. • Reads a variety of books, both fiction and nonfiction.	• Reads fluently at his/her independent reading level.

* Indicates grade level at which outcome is introduced.
* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIRST GRADE

	First Grade English Language Arts Reading Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
WORD IDENTIFICATION	• Uses inflectional endings to identify words (-s, -ing, -ed). • Uses the component parts of compounds and contractions to identify words. • Uses knowledge of long, short and R-controlled vowels to decode words in context.	• Names and matches all upper and lower case letters. • Recognizes 100-120 words by sight. • Uses beginning, ending and middle sounds to decode words in context. • Sounds out three-letter words with CVC (consonant-vowel-consonant) pattern in and out of context. • Uses context of sentence, paragraph or story to identify an unknown word in a selection read by the student.
WORD MEANING	• Uses synonyms and antonyms as a means to determine word meaning. • Uses context of sentence, paragraph or story to determine the meaning of an unknown word in a selection read by the student. • Identifies the word or phrase to which a pronoun refers, in a story being read by the student.	• Uses context of sentence, paragraph or story to determine the meaning of an unknown word in a selection read by the teacher. *(Kindergarten*)*
ATTITUDE		• Exhibits positive attitude toward reading. *(Kindergarten*)*

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS WRITING OUTCOMES

	First Grade English Language Arts Writing Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
PROCESS		
PREWRITING:	• Selects his/her own topic when given a specific writing task.	• Uses some pre-writing strategies e.g., drawing a picture, discussing with a partner, listing. *(Kindergarten*)*
DRAFTING	• Drafts directly onto the computer using a simple word processing program.	• Composes first drafts that maintain consistency of meaning for the student.
REVISING	• Rereads first draft and independently makes at least one revision. • Makes at least one revision in response to peer/adult feedback. • Shares drafts with people outside of the classroom: parents, librarian, other students, principal, etc.	• Responds with positive comments to another child's shared writing. • Shares writing frequently by reading to peers. *(Kindergarten*)*
PROOFREADING	• Proofreads for capitals (beginning of sentence, people's names and "I") and end-of-sentence punctuation.	
PUBLISHING		• Completes 2-3 writing tasks during the year that use all five stages of the writing process, with the whole group or through individual projects.

* Indicates grade level at which outcome is introduced.
* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIRST GRADE

	First Grade English Language Arts Writing Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
PRODUCT		
CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION	• Uses a variety of writing forms: - personal narratives *(Kindergarten*)* - descriptions *(Kindergarten*)* - explanations *(Kindergarten*)* - story retellings - poems. - fictional narratives - friendly letter	• Composes a draft of two or more thoughts on a topic using conventional and/or temporary spelling which can be read by the teacher. • Writes for different purposes e.g., science journals, notes to family and friends, directions. *(Kindergarten*)*
CONVENTIONS	• Uses temporary spelling and moves toward using conventional spelling. • Uses capitals (beginnings of sentences, people's names and "I") and end-of-sentence punctuation.	• Uses knowledge of letter sounds to write words. *(Kindergarten*)*
ATTITUDE		• Exhibits a positive view of own writing. *(Kindergarten*)*

MATHEMATICAL THINKING

	Mathematical Thinking	
	Focus on Development & Growth * (In all grades, K - 5)	Focus on Attainment ** (By end of Grade 5)
MATHEMATICAL PROBLEM SOLVING	• (See problem solving and logic strand by grade level.) • Work with others to solve problems.	• Formulate and solve problems in both group and individual settings.
MATHEMATICAL COMMUNICATION	• Model situations using oral, written, concrete, pictorial, graphical and algebraic methods. • Develop and use the language of mathematics, reflecting on and clarifying their own thinking about mathematical language and symbols. • Relate everyday language to mathematical language and symbols. • Represent and describe mathematical relationships.	• Communicate mathematically.
MATHEMATICAL REASONING	• Draw logical conclusions about mathematics. • Use models, known facts, properties and relationships to explain thinking. • Justify answers and solution processes. • Use patterns and relationships to analyze mathematical situations. • Believe that mathematics makes sense. • Link conceptual and procedural knowledge.	• Reason mathematically.

* Indicates grade level at which outcome is introduced.
* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECOND GRADE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS READING OUTCOMES

	Second Grade English Language Arts Reading Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
COMPREHENSION	• Listens to a variety of kinds of books and stories (both fiction and non-fiction). *(Kindergarten*)* • Uses comprehension strategies before reading e.g., generating background knowledge, previewing, predicting, developing questions to answer while reading. • Uses strategies to monitor own understanding of text e.g., paraphrasing, predicting and confirming/rejecting, questioning, retelling. • Uses strategies for dealing with obstacles to understanding e.g., rereading, reading on, consulting dictionary, asking others. • Identifies what he/she already knows before reading and what new information they have learned *after* reading (KWL). • Uses syntactic cues to construct meaning e.g., sentence structure, punctuation. *(Grade One*)* • States that authors have different purposes for writing e.g., to entertain, to persuade, to inform. *(Grade One*)* • States that the purpose of reading is to build the meaning of what you are reading, not just recognizing the words. *(Grade One*)*	• Uses background knowledge and information from a text (at student's independent reading level) to make inferences before and during reading. *(Grade One*)* • Sets purpose for reading. *(Kindergarten*)* • Recalls prior knowledge and personal experiences related to topic. *(Kindergarten*)*
NARRATIVE	• Analyzes characters' personality traits, physical attributes, feelings and motivation, citing evidence from the story. • Analyzes importance of key elements to the story: setting, personality of main character/s, specific event or character's action. • Identifies the unique characteristics of a variety of story forms e.g., fairy tales, folk tales, fables, realistic fiction. *(Grade One*)*	• Reads a second grade level fictional narrative independently with fluency and comprehension. • Retells orally a fictional narrative that he/she has read, including five story elements. *(Grade One*)* • Reads and gives a personal response to a story, providing supporting reasons. *(Kindergarten*)* • Compares/contrasts stories, characters, different versions of the same story, books by the same author, settings. *(Kindergarten*)*
INFORMATIONAL	• Explains concepts contained in informational text in his/her own words. • Identifies the unique characteristics of informational books and articles. *(Grade One*)*	• Identifies the topic and two supporting details of an informational book read to him/her. *(Grade One*)* • Retells orally an informational passage. *(Grade One*)*
STUDY SKILLS	• Recognizes/interprets graphic aids: - charts *(Grade One*)* - tables *(Grade One*)* - maps *(Grade One*)* - globes *(Grade One*)* - diagrams • Locates/uses text features: - publisher's name - index - copyright date - glossary	• Recognizes/interprets graphic aids. - illustrations *(Kindergarten*)* - graphs *(Kindergarten*)* • Locates/uses text features: - title, title page *(Kindergarten*)* - author's name, illustrator's name *(Kindergarten*)* - table of contents

* Indicates grade level at which outcome is introduced.
* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECOND GRADE

	Second Grade English Language Arts Reading Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
STUDY SKILLS (continued)	• Uses reference materials: - dictionary *(Grade One*)* - encyclopedia - magazines - audiovisual materials - information gathered in interviews • Organizes information using graphic aids e.g., Venn diagrams, charts, KWL, graphs, webs, etc.	
FLUENCY	• Reads 70-100 books by the end of the year.	• Reads fluently at his/her independent reading level. *(Kindergarten*)*
WORD IDENTIFICATION	• Uses common prefixes and suffixes to identify an unknown word.	• Uses inflectional endings to identify words (-s, -ing, -ed). *(Grade One*)* • Uses the component parts of compounds and contractions to identify words. *(Grade One*)* • Uses knowledge of long, short and R-controlled vowels to decode words in context. *(Grade One*)* • Uses context of sentence, paragraph or story to identify an unknown word. *(Grade One*)*
WORD MEANING	• Uses antonyms, synonyms and homonyms as a means to determine word meaning. *(Grade One*)* • Uses common prefixes and suffixes as a means to determine word meaning. • Uses context of sentence, paragraph or story to determine the meaning of an unknown word in a selection read by the student. *(Grade One*)*	• Identifies the word or phrase to which a pronoun refers, in a story being read by the student. *(Grade One*)*
ATTITUDE		• Demonstrates a positive attitude toward own ability to read. *(Kindergarten*)*

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS WRITING OUTCOMES

	Second Grade English Language Arts Writing Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
PROCESS *PREWRITING*	• Organizes ideas and thoughts on a self-selected topic.	• Uses prewriting strategies independently. *(Kindergarten*)* • Selects his/her own topic when given a specific writing task. *(Grade One*)*
DRAFTING		• Creates a first draft with fluency and confidence. • Drafts directly on the computer using a simple word processing program. (optional) *(Grade One*)*

* Indicates grade level at which outcome is introduced.
* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECOND GRADE

	Second Grade English Language Arts Writing Outcomes	
	Focus on Development & Growth *	Focus on Attainment **
REVISING	• Writes a second draft based on revisions. • Monitors text for meaning.	• Responds to writing shared by a peer i.e., positive comments and constructive suggestions for addition or change. • Rereads first draft and independently makes at least one revision. *(Grade One*)* • Makes at least one revision in response to peer/adult feedback. *(Grade One*)*
PROOFREADING	• Varies word choice, trying not to overuse any one word e.g., "said." • Proofreads for conventional spelling.	• Proofreads for capitals (beginnings of sentences, people's names and "I") and end-of-sentence punctuation. *(Grade One*)* • Makes at least one revision and one editing change while composing a draft at the computer. (optional)
PUBLISHING	• Produces final draft on the computer using a word processing program.	• Completes 2-3 writing tasks during the year that use all five stages of the writing process. *(Grade One*)* • Shares drafts with people outside of the classroom: parents, librarian, other students, principal, etc. *(Grade One*)*
PRODUCT CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION	• Uses a variety of writing forms: - retellings - descriptions *(Kindergarten*)* - explanations *(Kindergarten*)* - personal narratives *(Kindergarten*)* - fictional narratives *(Grade One*)* - poems *(Grade One*)* - friendly letters *(Grade One*)* - personal reflections - script	• Composes stories: personal and fictional narratives. • Produces informational writing: describes physical attributes of a person, place or thing. • Develops written reflections to literature read, heard or viewed. • Writes for different purposes e.g., to share what he/she has learned, to entertain, to give directions. *(Kindergarten*)*
CONVENTIONS	• Uses conventional spelling for most of his/her words. • States thoughts in complete sentences. • Uses a dictionary to confirm spelling of words. • Uses capital letters (beginnings of sentences, people's names and "I") and end-of-sentence punctuation. *(Grade One*)*	• Uses temporary spelling and moves toward using conventional spelling. *(Grade One*)*
ATTITUDE		• Exhibits a positive view of own writing. *(Kindergarten*)*

* Indicates grade level at which outcome is introduced.
* Essential skills/concepts/processes for which students will demonstrate learning and growth but not necessarily at an independent level.
** Essential skills/processes/concepts which all students will demonstrate independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES: LANGUAGE

KINDERGARTEN DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES
LANGUAGE
1994-1995

Kindergarten teachers and the Language Arts Consultant have identified selected outcomes to be assessed as part of the district-wide performance assessment. These outcomes reflect only part of the larger curriculum and instruction for language arts.

By the end of Kindergarten, the student:

READING

Comprehension:

5. Demonstrates knowledge of books and print.

6. Demonstrates knowledge of
   a. story structure.
   b. informational text structure.

Word Identification:

7. Recognizes most letters of the alphabet.

8. Identifies words/logos within the classroom and outside of school.

Attitude:

9. Exhibits positive reading behaviors.

WRITING

Process:

Drafting

10. Writes independently to convey meaning.

Optional: Uses a computer.

Optional: Uses a computer for writing.

Product:

Conventions

11. Uses, independently, some knowledge of letter sounds when writing.

12. Writes first name and last name by memory.

SPEAKING

13. Uses oral language to communicate.

© Ann Arbor Public Schools 1994/95 REPLACEMENT PAGE1995/96Kindergarten Language District-assessed Outcomes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIRST GRADE DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES
LANGUAGE
1994-1995

First grade teachers and the Language Arts Consultant have identified selected outcomes to be assessed as part of the district-wide performance assessment. These outcomes reflect only part of the larger curriculum and instruction for language arts.

By the end of First Grade, the student:

READING

Attitude:

Fall 1. Chooses and enjoys books independently.

Comprehension:

Fall 2. Demonstrates knowledge of story structure of story read to them.

3. Identifies the topic and two or more supporting details of an informational book read to the student.

Fluency:

4. Reads fluently at his or her independent reading level.

Word Identification:

Fall 5. Knows all upper and lower case letters.
   a. Names them.
   b. Matches them.

Fall 6. Reads books at end-of-first-grade level (1.6-2.2)

7. Uses a variety of strategies to identify an unknown word in a selection read by the student.

WRITING

Process:

Pre-writing

8. Uses some pre-writing strategies.

Drafting

Fall 9. Composes first drafts that maintain consistency of meaning for the student.

Revising

10. Responds with comments to another author's shared writing.

Optional Makes at least one revision while composing a draft at the computer.

Product:

Content and Organization

Winter 11. Composes a draft of two or more thoughts on a topic using temporary and/or conventional spelling which can be read by the teacher.

Conventions

Fall 12. Uses knowledge of letter sounds to write words.

Attitude:

Fall 13. Has a positive view of own-writing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECOND GRADE DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES
LANGUAGE
1994-1995

Second grade teachers and the Language Arts Consultant have identified selected outcomes to be assessed as part of the district-wide performance assessment. These outcomes reflect only part of the larger curriculum and instruction for language arts.

By the end of Second Grade, the student:

READING

Comprehension:

1a. Reads with fluency at his/her independent reading level.
1b. Constructs meaning from story read independently.
1c. Reads a fictional narrative independently at end of second grade (Expanding) level.

2. Gives and supports personal responses to stories read independently.

3. Identifies the topic and two supporting details of an informational book or article read by the student.

Word Identification:

4. Uses a variety of strategies to identify an unknown word in a selection read by the student.

WRITING

Process:

Pre-writing

5. Uses pre-writing strategies independently.

Drafting

6. Creates a first draft with fluency and confidence.

Revising

7. Responds to writing shared by a peer.

8. Makes at least two revisions.
   a. Rereads first draft and independently makes at least one revision.
   b. Makes at least one revision in response to peer/adult feedback.

Proofreading

9. Uses strategies to proofread for capitals and end-of-sentence punctuation.

Optional Makes at least one revision and one editing change while composing a draft at the computer.

Product:

Content and Organization

10. Composes
    a. Option A: Personal narratives
    or
    b. Option B: Imaginative stories.

Conventions

11. Uses temporary spelling and moves toward using conventional spelling in his/her writing.

APPENDIX C

CRITERIA FOR DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES: LANGUAGE ARTS

CRITERIA FOR KINDERGARTEN DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES
LANGUAGE ARTS
1994-1995

READING

COMPREHENSION:

5. Demonstrates Knowledge of Books and Print.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Holds book inappropriately for reading. Does not know where story begins or ends. Flips through pages randomly. Does not distinguish between letters, words, and numbers. Is unaware that words have meaning. Does not recognize own printed name.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Sometimes holds book properly. Sometimes finds beginning and end of story. Shows some knowledge of left to right process. Sometimes can point to where words are on a page. Is sometimes confused between letters, words, and numbers. Is becoming aware that words have meaning.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Holds book in ready-to-read position. Finds beginning of story (not title page) and end of story (last picture or print). Turns pages from front to back. Knows left page is read before right page. Tracks words by moving finger from: • left to right, • top to bottom of page. Distinguishes between letters, words, and numbers. Knows that words, not pictures, carry the message.	Has awareness of chapters, table of contents, indexes, etc. Explores encyclopedias, atlases, non-fiction books, and poetry; and has knowledge of the attributes of their different genres. Recognizes authors' and illustrators' styles. Reads pattern books not used for instruction. Knows that letters and groups of letters represent sounds. Matches letters to their sounds. Reads conventional print.

6a. Demonstrates Knowledge of Story Structure.

Note: Familiar stories may include:
1. stories frequently read or told many times, and/or
2. stories from television or movies.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not retell or dictate even a portion of a story in own words. Does not relate pictures to words.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Retells or dictates a portion of the story, using own words. Answers individual questions about parts of the story, with brief answers. Describes pictures to retell the story.	*Criterion:* Tells a story with characters and major events, with prompting when necessary. *Such as:* Retells a familiar story *(e.g., Caps for Sale, Three Bears).* Dictates an original story. May use props *(e.g., puppets, drama, pictures).*	Includes setting, characters, problem events, and/or resolution when: • retelling a story, just heard. • retelling a story student has read. • telling own story. Retells story in correct sequence: beginning, middle, and end. Identifies the pattern of a story.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6b. Demonstrates Knowledge of Informational Text Structure.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate following: Does not state the topic or any details from the text.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Tells something they know about the topic, but that was not covered in the text. Tells a story about the topic that may include some factual information. States topic but no details about the topic.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Identifies topic of text. Relates two or more facts (details) about the topic that were covered in the book.	Seeks out informational texts to pursue a topic of interest.

7. Recognizes Most Letters of the Alphabet.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Identifies in random order by pointing: • 0 - 12 letters. Does not know letters of own name.	*Criterion: May demonstrate following:* Identifies in random order by pointing or naming: • 13-19 letters. *Such as:* Names some of the letters in words they see around them. Recognizes letters when given sound, but not in visual isolation.	*Criterion:* Identifies in random order by naming: • 20 or more letters. *Such as:* Names letters in words they see around them *(e.g., letters of own name, signs, other people's names, books).*	Identifies upper and lower case letters. Matches upper case and lower case letters.

WORD IDENTIFICATION:

8. Identifies Words/Logos Within the Classroom and Outside of School.

Note: 1. This outcome addresses the issue that symbols convey meaning.
2. First assessed in the Fall in order to document growth over the year.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Is unaware of print in the environment. Does not identify names/words in context. Does not recognize own name.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently recognizes names/words in context. Makes attempts to identify environmental print. Identifies category but not specific name of place or product, *e.g.*, *store - [Kroger],* *cookie - [Oreos],* *cereal - [Kellogg's]* Recognizes own name, but not others'. Sweeps finger under words as s/he "reads" memorized text, but does not identify individual words. Only recognizes familiar commercial logos.	*Criterion:* Over time, routinely recognizes names/words in context. *Such as:* Identifies a variety of print in his/her environment: • signs in community *(e.g., Stop, In/Out, Exit, Kroger),* • product labels *(e.g., Kleenex, Jello)* • room signs/labels *(e.g., "sink", "door", "wall", "art center"),* • words from familiar books, • other students' names.	Identifies some sight words.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ATTITUDE:

9. Exhibits Positive Reading Behaviors.

Note: Reading refers to the behaviors of young children pretending to read by imitating real readers.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Demonstrates little confidence in own ability to interact with printed material *(e.g., "I can't read.")*. Shows little interest in books. Does not attend to reading activities.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Occasionally shows interest in reading. Takes a book if asked to, but shows limited interest. Attends to reading activities with teacher direction and support.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, is routinely actively involved with books during "almost-silent" reading time. Attends to reading activities by: • listening to stories, • joining in during the reading of familiar stories, • discussing stories, • responding to stories. *Such as:* Memorizes pattern books and familiar books. Responds to stories by: • asking to have a text re-read, • drawing pictures of favorite parts of a book, • using the text structure as a model for writing, • relating stories to personal experiences.	Reads the text in books conventionally.

WRITING

PROCESS:

Drafting

10. Writes Independently to Convey Meaning.

Note: Implies student has a sense of purpose for writing.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate following: Does not attempt to write.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Makes an attempt to write, with teacher encouragement. Begins to associate writing with meaning. Begins to write with a purpose. Rereads story without attending to "print." • tells about writing.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* When assigned a writing task, writes without hesitation. Writes for a variety of purposes *(e.g., shopping lists, messages)*. Reads back any form of writing s/he uses while attending to "print." *Such as:* Writes fluently to convey meaning, using scribble, pictures, letter strings, beginning sounds, and/or temporary spelling.	At a later time, goes back to a piece to work further on it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Optional: **Uses a Computer.**

Note: This outcome does not appear on the Report Form.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate following: Does the required tasks in a one-to-one setting as the teacher points and says, *"Press this button."*	*Such as: May demonstrate following:* Following teacher directions or the directions of a more experienced child, student: • inserts disc, • removes disc, • uses keyboard *(e.g., return key, escape key, arrow keys, number keys [1-9], letter keys [hunt & peck]).*	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following: Independently.* • inserts disc, • removes disc, • uses keyboard *(e.g., return key, escape key, arrow keys, number keys [1-9], letter keys [hunt & peck]).*	Retrieves disc and returns the disc to/from storage. Loads and saves own work. Learns to use a variety of software.

Optional: **Uses a Computer for Writing.**

Note: This outcome does not appear on the Report Form.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate following: Does not yet draft compositions directly on the computer.	*Such as: May demonstrate following:* Following teacher directions or the directions of a more experienced child, student drafts composition directly on the computer, using various early forms of writing.	*Criterion:* Drafts composition directly on the computer using various early forms of writing.	Learns other word processing skills: • deleting, • inserting, • changing fonts. Begins new story, finds old story, saves work.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONVENTIONS

11. Spelling Continuum: Uses, independently, some knowledge of letter sounds when writing.

Note: 1. Documents growth over the year.
2. Date the box in which a student's writing predominantly falls. Keep writing samples as documentation.

PRE-PHONETIC	SEMI-PHONETIC	PHONETIC	TRANSITIONAL	CONVENTIONAL
Pre-phonetic Spelling Stage: • drawing, • scribble, • random letter strings.	Semi-phonetic Spelling Stage: • letter sounds, beginning and final.	Phonetic Spelling Stage: • letter sounds, distinct words.	Transitional Spelling Stage: • vowels, • letter patterns.	Conventional Spelling Stage: • words spelled correctly.
Criteria: Writing reflects a pre-communicative form of spelling: • drawing, • scribble writing, • letters strung together randomly.	*Criteria:* Demonstrates knowledge that letters represent sounds. Begins to apply emerging knowledge of phonics to writing. Represents words with beginning and/or ending sounds.	*Criteria:* Spells most words like they sound (phonetically). Relies, primarily, on auditory memory.	*Criteria:* Undergoes transition from greater reliance on auditory memory of letter sounds to greater reliance on visual memory of spelling patterns. Spells many common words conventionally. Spells many words phonetically, applying phonetic, structural strategies. Begins to apply rules, although results may not be correct (*e.g., rite, goet, bose*).	*Criteria:* Although inconsistencies still exist, student has • accumulated a large body of known words, • shows growing accuracy in applying various language rules (including affixes, homophones, and silent letters), and • shows greater control over spelling resources such as dictionaries.
Such as: Uses pictures to convey message. May use letters to convey message, but they do not correspond to sounds (*e.g., FRHE for RABBIT*).	*Such as:* Is uncertain of some letter/sound connections. Sometimes spelling reflects confusion between letter sound and letter name (*e.g., YD for WORD*). Copies names/words. Uses pictures and print. One or two letters may represent whole word. May write some familiar words in ways others can understand. Uses very little conventional spelling (except if copied). May leave spaces between words.	*Such as:* Represents a sequence of sounds in a word (*e.g., EGL for EAGLE and BOTM for BOTTOM*). Spelling may reflect confusion between letter sounds and letter names (*e.g., YIL for WHILE*). Begins to spell a few non-phonetic words conventionally (*e.g., the, who, is*). Place usually shows a mixture of semi-phonetically, phonetically, and conventionally spelled words. Usually leave spaces between words.	*Such as:* Uses frequently used letter sequences. Vowels are used in every syllable (*not necessarily the correct one/s*). • examples: wood (*word*), tipe (*type*), laure (*lazy*)	*Such as:* Develops over years of word study and writing.

© Ann Arbor Public Schools 1994/95

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. Writes first and Last Name by Memory.

Note: If student uses nickname, use that name for the assessment.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Criteria: May demonstrate one or more of following:: On unlined paper, using any writing instrument: • does not reproduce first name by copying, • does not reproduce last name by copying.	*Criteria: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently, on unlined paper, using any writing instrument: • reproduces first and last name by copying, • rewrites some letters out of order, • omits one or more letters. Writes first name by memory, but not last name.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Routinely, on unlined paper, using any writing instrument, reproduces first and last names in upper and/or lower case letters. • all letters in correct order, • recognizable letters.	By memory, reproduces • names of family members, • names of friends, • address, • other words of personal importance.

13. Uses Oral Language to Communicate.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Speaks in one or two word combinations. Has limited vocabulary. Does not use oral language to convey meaning.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Speaks in phrases and short sentences. Comments are sometimes irrelevant to discussions. Is developing vocabulary to discuss everyday experiences, events, and objects.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Speaks fluently using complete sentences. Participates in discussions with relevant comments. Has sufficient vocabulary to discuss everyday experiences, events, and objects.	Uses a wide range of vocabulary. Includes details and descriptive words in (re)telling stories.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITERIA FOR FIRST GRADE DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES
LANGUAGE ARTS
1994-1995

READING

ATTITUDE:

1. Chooses and Enjoys Books Independently.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Needs to have teacher select book. Flips through pages while giving attention elsewhere. May refuse to select book or read book. Book remains on desk unopened. Still reads book back-to-front. Finds other things to do in place of reading.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Often depends on teacher direction to select book. Only chooses books used in class instruction. Spends a short time with books before losing interest. Reads only with a partner. Needs teacher assistance to select a book s/he can read independently.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Independently chooses books s/he likes to read and/or look at. Maintains interest in chosen book for a reasonable amount of time. *Such as:* Expresses enjoyment by talking about book ideas with teacher and/or peers. During free time, chooses to read. Enjoys books with and without a partner.	EXTENDING →

COMPREHENSION:

2. Demonstrates Knowledge of Story Structure of Story Read to Them.
(Kindergarten*)

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not reconstruct stories. Uses only one (1) story element when reconstructing a story. When asked questions about the story: • does not respond or • answers are off subject. Is learning to give full attention to the story being read. Shows little sense of sequence of story events.	*Criteria: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently reconstructs stories to reflect knowledge of all five story elements. Reconstructs only parts of story, including two (2) or three (3) of the story elements, with prompting if necessary: • setting *(Where? When?)*, • characters *(Who?)*, • problem *(What is it?)*, • most major events *(What happened?)*, • resolution *(How is problem solved?)*.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, consistently reconstructs stories to reflect knowledge of all five (5) story elements, in a story read to them. • setting *(Where? When?)*, • characters *(Who?)*, • problem *(What is it?)*, • most major events *(What happened?)*, • resolution *(How is problem solved?)*. *Such as:* Retelling a story, Completing a story map, Writing, Recreating story in drawings, Dramatizing, Puppet show, Readers' theater, Book talk, Comparing two stories.	EXTENDING → Reconstructs a story s/he has read independently and includes all five (5) elements, with prompting if necessary. Answers "why" questions about the story.

**Indicates grade level in which outcome was introduced.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Identifies the Topic and Two or More Supporting Details of an Informational Book Read to Students.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Identifies the topic but does not identify any details from the book. Cites information incorrectly. Draws only from personal experience rather than from evidence in the book. Identifies details but not topic.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Identifies topic and one (1) detail from the book. Identifies several details, but needs prompting to clearly state the main topic.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Identifies from an informational book: • topic of book. • two or more supporting details. *Such as:* *" This book is about whales. The blue whale is the largest animal on earth. Whales have babies that are born alive - not hatched."*	Identifies main ideas. Identifies background knowledge. Distinguishes between what s/he already knew and what was just learned. Identifies topic and details of an informa- tional book read by student.

FLUENCY:

4. Reads Fluently At His or Her Independent Reading Level.

Note: To achieve this outcome, the story used for assessment:
1. May have been introduced to the student with a "typical" pre-reading introduction,
2. Should have been recently read by student,
3. Should not have been used for instruction, and
4. Should not be a pattern book.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Sounds out most words read. Reads word by word *(e.g., He -- went -- home -- after -- school).* Reads fluently a memorized text. Miscues do not make sense. Does not self-correct.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Reads fluently a patterned book not used for instruction. Is sometimes slowed by word identification problems. Reads in "spurts" rather than in meaningful phrases *(e.g., [He went] [home] [after school.]).* Repeats words/phrases. Omits words/phrases. Loses place sometimes. Occasionally self-corrects miscues that do not make sense.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, consistently reads with: • freedom from word identification problems, • smoothness *(words flow in a natural talking style),* • attention to end-of-sentence punctuation, Self-corrects miscues that do not make sense.	

WORD IDENTIFICATION:

5a. Names all Upper and Lower Case Letters. *(Kindergarten)*

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Criteria: May demonstrate one or more of following: Identifies less than 20 upper case letters *(in random order)* by naming them. Identifies less than 20 lower case letters *(in random order)* by naming them. *Such as:* Identifies letters *(upper and lower case)* only in alphabetical order.	*Criteria: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Identifies 20 or more upper case letters *(in random order)* by naming them. Identifies 20 or more lower case letters *(in random order)* by naming them.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Identifies 26 upper case letters *(in random order)* by naming them. Identifies 26 lower case letters *(in random order)* by naming them. *Such as:* Names letters *(when asked)* on a printed page *(flash cards, posters, books, magazines, own writing).*	Writes word correctly in upper and lower case letters when it has been spelled orally.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5b. Matches all Upper and Lower Case Letters.

NOT YET - 1	2 DEVELOPING - 3 4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Criterion: May demonstrate following: Matches fewer than 20 upper case letters with corresponding lower case letters in random order.	*Criterion: May demonstrate following:* Matches 20-25 upper case letters with corresponding lower case letters in random order. *Such as:* Confuses upper and lower case letters in matching activities.	*Criterion:* Matches all 26 upper case letters with corresponding lower case letters in random order.	EXTENDING → Writes word correctly in upper and lower case letters when it has been spelled orally.

6. Reads Books Independently at End-of-First-Grade Reading Level (Beginning).
On next page

7. Uses a Variety of Strategies to Identify an Unknown Word in a Selection Read the Student.

NOT YET - 1	2 DEVELOPING - 3 4	ACHIEVING - 5
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Relies on teacher or other readers for identifying unknown words.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Uses strategies with teacher assistance. Relies primarily on one strategy. Aware that miscue does not make sense, but unable to self-correct.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, routinely uses different strategies, as needed: • picture clues, • context clues, • sight words, • phonetic clues, • structural clues. *Such as:* Miscues make sense (*e.g., father/dad*). Self-corrects if miscue does not make sense.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. Reads Books Independently at End-of-First-Grade Reading Level (Beginning)

Note: 1. (*) indicates additional titles provided by teachers in workshops or used by teachers for end-of-year assessment.
2. "Typical" pre-reading introduction may be given to the book before student reads it for the first time.
3. Story should have been read recently by student, but not used for instruction.

EMERGENT	DEVELOPING	BEGINNING	EXPANDING	BRIDGING
After having multiple experiences with a book, "reads" little predictable books that: • have been memorized, • have repetitive/cumulative patterns, • have rhyming patterns and/or • have familiar sequences (e.g., alphabet, colors, numbers). "Reads" books attending only to pictures. After having an introduction, reads little predictable books such as Levels A or B of Story Box, Sunshine, e.g., • *The Ghost* • *In the Mirror* • *Huggies Breakfast* • *Monster Sandwich* • *The Tree House* • *Yuck Soup*	Reads books such as: • *Nobody Listens to Andrew* • *Where Are You Going, Little Mouse?* • *Whose Mouse Are You?* • *Where's Spot?* • *A Kiss for Little Bear* • Margaret Hillert books • *My New Boy* • Phonetic readers • Simple word pattern books	Reads beginning reader books such as: • *Frog and Toad Are Friends** • *Frog and Toad All Year* • *Owl at Home* • *Little Bear* • *Little Bear's Visit* • *Mouse Soup* • *Mouse Tales* • *Danny and the Dinosaur* • *Henry and Mudge: The First Book** • *And I Mean It, Stanley** • *Jeremy's Tail* (HBJ)* • *The Case of the Cat's Meow** • *I Am Not Afraid** • *Lovable Lyle** • *Arthur's Tooth**	Reads picture books and short chapter books such as: • *Freckle Juice** • *The Littles* • *The Tenth Good Thing About Barney* • *Ming Lo Moves the Mountain** • *Wagon Wheels** • Julian stories • Cam Jansen books • Boxcar Children books • Horrible Harry series • Magic Tree House series • *Monster in the Third Dresser Drawer* • *Mrs. Piggle Wiggle* • *Dr. DeSoto* • *The Terrible Eek* (HBJ)* • *Ma Lien and the Magic Brush** • *Alexander, Who Used to Be Rich.....** • *Henry Huggins** • *The Day Jimmy's Boa Ate the Wash**	Independently reads medium level chapter books such as: • *Little House on the Prairie* • *Trumpet of the Swan* • *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* • *Chocolate Touch* • *Pippy Longstocking*
		• *Nate the Great* • Polk Street series		• *The Stone Fox* • *The Comeback Dog* • *Sarah Plain and Tall* • *Dear Mr. Henshaw*

These lists reflect a refinement of lists used last year, based on (1) development of the Primary Continuum and (2) increased teacher experience and recommendations. Refinement will continue as continued experience and dialogue inform our professional judgments and decisions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WRITING

PROCESS:

PREWRITING

8. Uses Some Pre-writing Strategies. ***(Kindergarten)***

Note: Suggested instructional sequence:
1. Strategies should be modeled, taught, and practiced with whole group.
2. Teachers should provide guided practice for students as they work in small groups or pairs.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not participate in pre-writing activities. Consistently needs help choosing a topic. Draws pictures which do not lead to writing.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Frequently needs help choosing a topic. Needs teacher prompting to follow through with: • generating own ideas, • selecting thoughts, • incorporating the ideas into first draft.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, routinely chooses a topic. Uses a variety of pre-writing strategies, when assigned by the teacher: • drawing, • listing, • sharing with a friend, • brainstorming, • mapping • webbing/clustering. Uses the pre-writing strategy identified by the teacher to: • generate own ideas, • select thoughts, • incorporate those ideas into first draft.	EXTENDING → Independently selects and uses a pre-writing strategy. Names at least two pre-writing strategies.

DRAFTING

9. Composes First Drafts That Maintain Consistency of Meaning for the Student. ***(Kindergarten)***

Note: 1. If you are not sure that the student has really read the draft, have the student track with his/her finger while reading.
2. First assessed in the Fall in order to document growth over the course of the year.
3. Accumulate work samples over the course of the year.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Uses only words and/or phases for first draft. Asks teacher, *"What did I write?"* during writing session. Forgets what was written during the same writing session.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently composes a first draft with two (2) or more connected thoughts on a topic. Composes first draft with only one sentence. Rereads own writing on the same day it was written, but not several days later. Retells story rather than rereads own writing. Needs help decoding some of own spelling.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, routinely composes a first draft with two (2) or more connected thoughts on a topic. Uses enough phonetic spelling and memory of the story to accurately reread the draft. Rereads own writing with consistency of meaning several days later. *Such as:* Reads previous journal entries. Reads accurately own page from class published books.	EXTENDING → Rereads drafts written anytime during the year with consistency of meaning.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REVISING

10. Responds With Comments to Another Author's Shared Writing.

Note: 1. This can be demonstrated in large or small groups, or in pairs.
2. Writing may be that of peer, "upper-class" students, teacher, published author, etc.

NOT YET - 1	2	DEVELOPING - 3	4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not say anything about another author's writing. Inattentive to writing shared.		*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently responds to the content of another author's work. Responds with comments that: • are not relevant to writing at hand *(e.g., Billy writes about his pet dog. Student responds, "Billy and I went to the park.")*, • relate only to him/herself *(e.g., Susie wrote about her cat. Student responds, "I have a cat, too.")*. Repeatedly makes the same comment *(e.g., "I like the topic you chose.")*		*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, routinely responds to the content of another author's work. Cites a reason to support comments *(e.g., "Jamal, I like the way you talk about your dog." [Why?] "Because you tell how naughty he is.")*. *Such as:* Kinds of comments may refer to: • descriptive adjectives *(color, size)*, • particularly interesting words *(fluffy)*, • feelings *(happy, angry, scared)*, • opinions *(like, dislike)*, • events or characters in a story.	Responds to writing by first offering a positive comment and citing a reason for response, then asking for additional information. Consistently volunteers thoughtful comments about another author's writing.

Optional **Makes at Least One Revision While Composing a Draft at the Computer.** *(Kindergarten)*

Note: This outcome does not appear on the Report Form.

NOT YET - 1	2	DEVELOPING - 3	4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Criteria: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not draft a composition on the computer. Drafts a composition on the computer, but does not make a revision, even with teacher support.		*Criteria: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Drafts a composition on the computer but needs teacher support to make any revisions. Needs help to draft a composition on the computer, but then makes at least one revision in the process.		*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Drafts composition directly on the computer. Makes at least one revision on the draft: • adds more information, • inserts missing words, • deletes/changes overused words. *Such as:* Possible reasons for revisions: • changes mind about what s/he wants to say, • elaborates on a draft begun at an earlier time.	Makes at least one (1) editing change to correct: • capitalization *(e.g., at beginning of sentences, people's names, the word, "I")*, • end of sentence punctuation, • spelling errors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRODUCT:

CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION

11. Composes a Draft of Two or More Thoughts on a Topic Using Temporary and/or Conventional Spelling Which Can be Read by the Teacher.

NOT YET - 1	2	DEVELOPING - 3	4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Writes with pictures, scribbles, letter strings. Does not begin task. Writes lists of words. Only copies from books, classroom print, other student's writing. Uncomfortable/unwilling to use temporary spelling.		*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently composes two or more connected thoughts on a topic. Needs active teacher support during the process. Composes a draft following a sentence pattern. *"I like apples."* *"I like oranges."* Only writes one thought. Willing to use temporary spelling, even though difficult. Thoughts are not related. Some meaning cannot be discerned by teacher.		*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, routinely composes two or more connected thoughts on a topic. Uses temporary and/or conventional spelling sufficiently so teacher can read and understand the message. *Such as:* Examples of connected thoughts: *"I like apples. They grow on trees."* *"My grandma is coming this weekend and she is taking us to the circus."*	EXTENDING → Writes: • a personal narrative. • an imaginative story. • description of person, place or thing. • written reflections to literature read, heard, or viewed.

CONVENTIONS

12.Spelling Continuum: Uses knowledge of letter sounds to write words.

On next page

ATTITUDE:

13. Has a Positive View of Own Writing.

NOT YET - 1	2	DEVELOPING - 3	4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not draw or write independently. Frequently says, *"I can't write."* Does not want others to see, hear, or read his/her writing. Groans when asked to write. Reluctant to share own writing with peers.		*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Willing to write but needs reassurance and support. Willing to share writing - with encouragement. Occasionally shows pride in writing. Occasionally willing to share own writing with peers.		*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Eagerly begins to write when directed. Willingly shares writing with others. *Such as:* Seeks opportunities to share writing with others. Shows pride in own writing: *"I can write."* *"Look at this!"* *"See my story."*	EXTENDING → Chooses to write during free time. Spends long periods of time writing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONVENTIONS

FALL 12. **Spelling Continuum: Uses knowledge of letter sounds to write words.** *(Kindergarten)*

Note: 1. First assessed in the Fall in order to document growth over the course of the year.
2. Date the box in which a student's writing predominantly falls. Keep writing samples as documentation.

PRE-PHONETIC	SEMI-PHONETIC	PHONETIC	TRANSITIONAL	CONVENTIONAL
Pre-phonetic Spelling Stage • drawing, • scribble, • random letter strings.	Semi-phonetic Spelling Stage: • letter sounds, beginning and final.	Phonetic Spelling Stage: • letter sounds, distinct words.	Transitional Spelling Stage: • vowels, • letter patterns.	Conventional Spelling Stage: • words spelled correctly.
Criteria: Writing reflects a pre-communicative form of spelling: • drawing, • scribble writing, • letters strung together randomly.	*Criteria:* Demonstrates knowledge that letters represent sounds. Begins to apply emerging knowledge of phonics to writing. Represents words with beginning and/or ending sounds.	*Criteria:* Spells most words like they sound (phonetically). Relies, primarily, on auditory memory.	*Criteria:* Undergoes transition from greater reliance on auditory memory of letter sounds to greater reliance on visual memory of spelling patterns. Spells many common words conventionally. Spells many words phonetically, applying phonetic, structural strategies. Begins to apply rules, although results may not be correct (*e.g., rite, goez, botv*).	*Criteria:* Although inconsistencies still exist, student has • accumulated a large body of known words, • shows growing accuracy in applying various language rules (including affixes, homophones, and silent letters), and • shows greater control over spelling resources such as dictionaries.
Such as: Uses pictures to convey message. May use letters to convey message, but they do not correspond to sounds (*e.g., FRHE for RABBIT*).	*Such as:* Is uncertain of some letter/sound connections. Sometimes spelling reflects confusion between letter sound and letter name (*e.g., YD for WORD*). Copies some words. Uses pictures and print. One or two letters may represent whole word. May write some familiar words in ways others can understand. Uses very little conventional spelling (except if copied). May leave spaces between words.	*Such as:* Represents a sequence of sounds in a word (*e.g., EGL for EAGLE and BOTM for BOTTOM*). Spelling may reflect confusion between letter sounds and letter names (*e.g., YIL for WHILE*). Begins to spell a few non-phonetic words conventionally (*e.g., the, who, is*). Piece usually shows a mixture of semi-phonetically, phonetically, and conventionally spelled words. Usually leave spaces between words.	*Such as:* Uses frequently used letter sequences. Vowels are used in every syllable (*not necessarily the correct ones*). • examples: werd (*word*), tipe (*type*), luses (*lazy*)	*Such as:* Develops over years of word study and writing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITERIA FOR SECOND GRADE DISTRICT-ASSESSED OUTCOMES
LANGUAGE ARTS
1994-1995

READING

COMPREHENSION:

1a. Reads with Fluency at His/Her Independent Reading Level. *(First Grade*)*

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Reads word by word. Relies heavily on sounding out words.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently reads with the following: • freedom from word identification problems, • smoothness, • phrasing, • inflection, • expression, • attention to punctuation.	*Criterion:* Reads with fluency: • free from word identification problems, • smoothness, • natural phrasing, • inflection, • expression, • attention to punctuation.	Reads fluently: • to an audience, • to younger children, • to peers.

1b. Constructs Meaning from Story Read Independently. *(Kindergarten)*

Note: This record documents that students are able to read books at increasing levels of difficulty.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not reconstruct stories. Uses only one (1) element in reconstructing a story. Shows little sense of sequence of story events. Does not self-correct miscues that affect meaning. Does not yet read a story containing the five story elements.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently self-corrects miscues that affect meaning. Reconstructs only parts of story including two (2) or three (3) of the elements: • characters, • setting (time and place), • problem, • major events, • resolution.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Self-corrects miscues that affect meaning. Uses context to construct meaning of an unknown word or phrase. Reconstructs story to reflect knowledge of five (5) story elements: • characters, • setting, • problem, • major events, • resolution. *(If necessary, limited prompting may be used.)* *Such as:* Routinely constructs meaning by monitoring understanding before, during, and after reading.	Uses oral and/or written response: • to give lots of details about: characters, setting, problem, major events, and resolution. • to identify central theme of the story. • to create a new ending/or sequel. Answers questions at three levels (QAR) • right there, • think and search, • on my own.

* *Indicates grade level in which outcome was introduced.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1c. Reads a Fictional Narrative Independently at an End of Second Grade (Expanding) Level.

Note: 1. (*) Indicates additional titles provided by teachers in workshops or used by teachers for end-of-year assessment.
2. "Typical" pre-reading introduction may be given to the book before student reads it for the first time.
3. Story should have been read recently by student, but not used for instruction.

EMERGENT	DEVELOPING	BEGINNING	EXPANDING	BRIDGING
After having multiple experiences with a book, "reads" little predictable books that: • have been memorized, • have repetitive/cumulative patterns, • have rhyming patterns and/or • have familiar sequences (e.g., alphabet, colors, numbers). "Reads" books attending only to pictures. After having an introduction, reads little predictable books such as Levels A or B of Story Box, Sunshine, e.g., • *The Ghost* • *In the Mirror* • *Huggles Breakfast* • *Monster Sandwich* • *The Tree House* • *Yuck Soup*	Reads books such as: • *Nobody Listens to Andrew* • *Where Are You Going, Little Mouse?* • *Whose Mouse Are You?* • *Where's Spot?* • *A Kiss for Little Bear* • Margaret Hillert books • *My New Boy* • Phonetic readers • Simple word pattern books	Reads beginning reader books such as: • *Frog and Toad Are Friends** • *Frog and Toad All Year* • *Owl at Home* • *Little Bear* • *Little Bear's Visit* • *Mouse Soup* • *Mouse Tales* • *Danny and the Dinosaur* • *Henry and Mudge: The First Book** • *And I Mean It, Stanley** • *Jeremy's Tail* (HBJ)* • *The Case of the Cat's Meow** • *I Am Not Afraid** • *Lovable Lyle** • *Arthur's Tooth**	Reads picture books and short chapter books such as: • *Freckle Juice** • *The Littles* • *The Tenth Good Thing About Barney* • *Ming Lo Moves the Mountain** • *Wagon Wheels** • Julian stories • Cam Jansen books • Boxcar Children books • Horrible Harry series • Magic Tree House series • *Monster in the Third Dresser Drawer* • *Mrs. Piggle Wiggle* • *Dr. DeSoto* • *The Terrible Eek* (HBJ)* • *Ma Lien and the Magic Brush** • *Alexander, Who Used to Be Rich.....** • *Henry Huggins** • *The Day Jimmy's Boa Ate the Wash**	Independently reads medium level chapter books such as: • *Little House on the Prairie* • *Trumpet of the Swan* • *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* • *Chocolate Touch* • *Pippy Longstocking*
		• *Nate the Great* • Polk Street series		• *The Stone Fox* • *The Comeback Dog* • *Sarah Plain and Tall* • *Dear Mr. Henshaw*

These lists reflect a refinement of lists used last year, based on (1) development of the Primary Continuum and (2) increased teacher experience and recommendations. Refinement will continue as continued experience and dialogue inform our professional judgments and decisions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Gives and Supports Personal Responses to Stories Read Independently.

(Kindergarten)

Note: Books or stories may be chosen by the teacher or student.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Has trouble comprehending the story; therefore, has trouble giving a reasoned opinion. Does not give responses to a story independently read: • own point of view, • ideas about characters, events, resolution, and setting. Reflections are irrelevant to the specific story.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently states a personal point of view about a story. Gives own point of view, but does not provide supporting reasons. Lacks logical connections between point of view and support. *(See "such as" examples in Achieving column.)*	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, routinely states a personal point of view about stories. Makes personal connections between text and prior knowledge or experiences. Identifies specific story events, characters, or illustrations, to support his/her point of view. *Such as:* Discusses whether or not s/he likes a character in the story, why or why not. Discusses own opinion on how a specific character felt or behaved, and reasons. Explains how s/he was thinking at a particular point in the story, and why. *"I liked this story. I liked this part where a dragon blew fire out of his mouth and scared all the town's people away."* *"I liked this story because I love stories about dragons. The dragons were scary. I also liked the part when the boy made friends with the dragon."*	When comparing/ contrasting stories, expresses a preference and gives reasons.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Identifies the Topic and Two Supporting Details of an Informational Book Read by Students. ***(First Grade)***

Note: 1. The book read by the students could be a simple Wright Group or Rigby informational book or a ++ informational picture book such as: books from science units, biographies, and concept books.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Identifies the topic but does not identify any details from the book. Confuses the concepts of topic and details. Cites information incorrectly. Draws from background (prior) knowledge rather than evidence from the book.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Identifies topic and one (1) detail from the book.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Identifies from an informational book: • topic of book, • two or more supporting details. *Such as:* *" This book is about whales. The blue whale is the largest animal on earth. Whales have babies that are born alive - not hatched."*	EXTENDING → Identifies main ideas. Identifies background knowledge. Distinguishes between what s/he already knew and what was just learned.

WORD IDENTIFICATION:

4. Uses a Variety of Strategies to Identify an Unknown Word in a Selection Read by the Student. ***(First Grade)***

Note: For confident readers, use a book at their instructional level (i.e., a book which includes some unknown words).

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Reads word by word. Does not get meaning from sentence, paragraph, or story. Does not self-correct for meaning *(e.g., "My mom is at my horse now.").*	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently uses a variety of strategies to identify unknown words. Uses strategies with teacher assistance. Relies primarily on one or two strategies *(e.g., picture clues and phonics).* Aware that miscue does not make sense, but unable to self-correct.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Over time, routinely uses a variety of strategies to identify an unknown word by independently applying any or all of them, as needed: • picture clues, • context clues, • phonetic clues, • structural clues, • sight words. *Such as:* Miscues make sense. *(e.g., father/dad)* Self-corrects by choosing the word appropriate to context: • recognizes word doesn't make sense, • pauses to think about correct meaning of word in sentence/phrase, • rereads sentence or phrase for meaning.	EXTENDING →

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WRITING

PROCESS:

Pre-writing

5. Uses Pre-writing Strategies Independently. ***(Kindergarten)***

Note: "Independently" refers to the student generating and using ideas without assistance. Suggested instructional sequence:

a. Strategies should be modeled, taught, and practiced with whole group.
b. Teachers should provide guided practice for students as they work in small groups or pairs.
c. Students should practice independently.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Consistently needs help choosing a topic. Draws pictures which do not lead to writing.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Frequently needs help identifying a topic. Needs help in using prewriting strategies to: • generate own ideas, • select thoughts, • incorporate those ideas into first draft. Uses one (1) pre-writing strategy independently.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Identifies topic. Uses a variety of pre-writing strategies independently *(one of which will involve writing), (either student-selected or teacher-directed).* • gathering information, • mapping, • listing, • webbing/clustering, • brainstorming, • drawing, • sharing with a friend. Uses pre-writing strategies to: • generate own ideas, • select thoughts, • incorporate those ideas into first draft.	Uses additional pre-writing strategies. • sequence maps, • cartoon series of events, • creative mapping, • role playing, • free-writing, • visualizing, • categorizing, • time lines, • interviewing, • reading. Self-selects strategies appropriate to purpose.

Drafting

6. Creates a First Draft with Fluency and Confidence. ***(Kindergarten)***

Note: Grade 1 target is "two or more thoughts on a topic."

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following Does not begin, even with teacher encouragement. Does not express self in complete thoughts.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following* Needs teacher to begin. Begins writing but needs encouragement to continue. Some thoughts are incomplete. Concern about spelling and/or mechanics interferes with flow of thoughts.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Writes without hesitation. Expresses self in complete thoughts. Spelling and mechanics do not interfere with the flow of transferring thoughts to paper.	After drafting, proceeds to reread and revise on own initiative.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Revising

7. Responds to Writing Shared by a Peer. *(First Grade)*

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not respond to writing shared by a peer with either positive comment or a question. Inattentive to writing shared by a peer. Comments offered are unrelated to the content of the writing shared by a peer.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Makes positive comments but does not frame a question. Asks question but does not make positive comment. Makes positive comment and asks question only with teacher encouragement. Makes positive comment and asks question but not always related to the content of the writing. Repeatedly makes the same comment *(e.g., "I like the topic you chose to write about." "I like the way you developed your idea.").*	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Willingly responds to writing shared by a peer by: • offering a positive comment and • requesting additional information *(e.g., "What was the name of the captain?" or "How tall was the snowman?").* Keeps comments focused on the content of the writing.	Finds many opportunities, through own initiative, to: • give positive responses to peer's writing, • ask questions to help peer with clarification and elaboration. Offers constructive and appropriate suggestions for improvement.

8a. Rereads First Draft and Independently Makes at Least One Revision. *(First Grade)*

Note: 1. Revision refers to content and clarity of ideas - not to conventions (spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and handwriting).
2. Revisions may be made on first draft; recopying is not necessary.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not recognize the need to revise. Needs to be told what revisions to make, but still cannot execute.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Recognizes need to revise, but needs guidance to execute: • missing words, • overuse of a word, • adding more information, • identifying the noun to which a pronoun refers.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Revises draft, where necessary, for: • missing words, • overuse of a word *(e.g., then...then, and...and),* • adding more information or ideas, • identifying the noun to which a pronoun refers.	Rereads and revises on own initiative. Writer: • on own initiative, finds peer/adult to get feedback, • identifies an area of concern.

8b. Makes at Least One Revision in Response to Specific Peer/Adult Feedback. *(First Grade)*

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not listen to feedback given by others. Does not consider feedback given by others. Does not incorporate at least one idea from others into draft.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Considers feedback from others but makes no revision. Makes an inappropriate revision in response to feedback.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Actively listens to feedback from others: • gives complete attention to peer or adult, • may ask questions for clarification. Actively considers feedback from others *(i.e., thinks carefully about what revision to make).* Incorporates at least one idea from others into draft in a meaningful way.	Participates in a dialogue about his/her writing: • makes comments, • asks questions for clarification, • considers audience. Initiates own questions about own writing that may appear unclear. Identifies own area(s) of concern.

Proofreading

9. Uses Strategies to Proofread for Capitals and End-of-Sentence Punctuation ***(First Grade)***

Note: The target is for students to know HOW to proofread. They should be able to find some (two or more errors); it is not expected that they find and correct them all.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Has trouble knowing when sentences begin and when they end. Does not discriminate which words should begin with capitals. Does not proofread.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Inconsistently uses proofreading strategies to correct some capitals and some end-of-sentence punctuation.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Consistently uses proofreading strategies to correct some capitals and some end-of-sentence punctuation. Applies strategies independently and with peers. *Such as:* Corrects for capitals: • at beginning of sentences, • people's names, • the word, "I". Corrects for end of sentence punctuation (?), (.), (!). Strategies: • read your paper aloud to peer/self, • circle error and make correction, • proofread for one convention at a time *(e.g., read to look for missing punctuation, then go back just to check for capital letters).*	Proofreads for capitals: • titles, • proper nouns, • important places. Proofreads for punctuation: • commas, • quotation marks. Proofreads for spelling. Uses standard proofreading marks.

OPTIONAL **Makes At Least One Revision and One Editing Change While Composing* a Draft at the Computer.** ***(*Kindergarten)***

Note: This outcome does not appear on the Report Form.

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not recognize the need to revise or edit. Needs to be told what revisions or editing changes to make, but still does not make them.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Recognizes need to revise or edit, but needs prompt or guidance to make changes.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Composes at the computer. Makes at least one (1) revision on the draft: • adding more information, • inserting words, • deleting/changing words. Makes at least one (1) editing change to correct: • capitalization *(e.g., at beginning of sentences, people's names, the word, "I").* • end of sentence punctuation, • spelling errors.	Revises for a variety of purposes. Moves words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs around to improve meaning and organization. Makes punctuation changes: • quotation marks, • commas in a series.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRODUCT:

Content and Organization

10a. Option A: Composes Personal Narratives. ***(Kindergarten)***

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not write personal narratives. Narrative primarily addresses only the beginning *(e.g., I had a birthday party yesterday.).* Passage is unreadable by an independent reader. Sentences do not relate to the topic.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Includes two (2) of the following, *(with teacher assistance):* • beginning, • middle (development of idea), • end (conclusion). Includes information which addresses some elements of personal narratives, *e.g., Who? Where? When? What? How? Why?* Ideas are not logically sequenced. Contains extraneous ideas. Lengthy narrative not brought to closure.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Writes personal narratives that contain the following: • beginning, • middle (development of idea), • end (conclusion). Includes information which addresses elements of personal narratives, *e.g., Who? Where? When? What? How? Why?* Uses logical order. Reflects clarity of thought. Writing flows from one part to the next. Message makes sense. All sentences relate to the topic. Creates titles for compositions *(may need teacher prompt).*	Includes information which addresses all of the following: Who? Where? When? What? How? Why? Varies sentence patterns and word choices. Includes vivid descriptive language.

or

10b. Option B: Composes Imaginative Stories. ***(First Grade)***

NOT YET - 1	2 | DEVELOPING - 3 | 4	ACHIEVING - 5	EXTENDING →
Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following: Does not write imaginative stories. Story primarily addresses only the beginning *(e.g., The prince is angry at the king.).* Passage is unreadable by an independent reader. Sentences do not relate to the topic.	*Such as: May demonstrate one or more of following:* Includes information about some of the following: • characters, • setting, • problem, • major events, • resolution/conclusion. Includes two (2) of the following, *(with teacher assistance):* • beginning, • middle (development of idea), • end (conclusion). Story elements require further development. Ideas are not logically sequenced. Contains extraneous ideas. Lengthy narrative not brought to closure.	*Criteria: Demonstrates all of following:* Writes imaginative stories that include story elements, *e.g.,* • *characters,* • *setting,* • *problem,* • *major events,* • *resolution/conclusion (may need teacher assistance).* Includes: • beginning, • middle (development of idea), • end (conclusion). Uses logical order. Reflects clarity of thought. Writing flows from one part to the next. Message makes sense. All sentences relate to the topic. Creates titles for compositions *(may need teacher prompt).*	Uses dialogue appropriately. Uses vivid, descriptive language. Tells about characters' feelings. Includes description and details about: • characters, • setting, • problem, • major events, • resolution/conclusion. Varies sentence patterns and word choices.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONVENTIONS

11. Spelling Continuum: Uses temporary spelling and moves toward using conventional spelling.

(Kindergarten)

Note: 1. First assessed in the Fall in order to document growth over the course of the year.
2. Date the box in which a student's writing predominantly falls. Keep writing samples as documentation.

PRE-PHONETIC	SEMI-PHONETIC	PHONETIC	TRANSITIONAL	CONVENTIONAL
Pre-phonetic Spelling Stage • drawing, • scribble, • random letter strings.	Semi-phonetic Spelling Stage • letter sounds, beginning and final.	Phonetic Spelling Stage • letter sounds, distinct words.	Transitional Spelling Stage • vowels, • letter patterns.	Conventional Spelling Stage • words spelled correctly.
Criteria: Writing reflects a pre-communicative form of spelling: • drawing, • scribble writing, • letters strung together randomly.	*Criteria:* Demonstrates knowledge that letters represent sounds. Begins to apply emerging knowledge of phonics to writing. Represents words with beginning and/or ending sounds.	*Criteria:* Spells most words like they sound (phonetically). Relies, primarily, on auditory memory.	*Criteria:* Undergoes transition from greater reliance on auditory memory of letter sounds to greater reliance on visual memory of spelling patterns. Spells many common words conventionally. Spells many words phonetically, applying phonetic, structural strategies. Begins to apply rules, although results may not be correct *(e.g., rise, gaet, boie).*	*Criteria:* Although inconsistencies still exist, student has • accumulated a large body of known words, • shows growing accuracy in applying various language rules (including affixes, homophones, and silent letters), and • shows greater control over spelling resources such as dictionaries.
Such as: Uses pictures to convey message. May use letters to convey message, but they do not correspond to sounds *(e.g., FRHE for RABBIT).*	*Such as:* Is uncertain of some letter/sound connections. Sometimes spelling reflects confusion between letter sound and letter name *(e.g., YD for WORD).* Copies names/words. Uses pictures and print. One or two letters may represent whole word. May write some familiar words in ways others can understand. Uses very little conventional spelling (except if copied). May leave spaces between words.	*Such as:* Represents a sequence of sounds in a word *(e.g., EGL for EAGLE and BOTM for BOTTOM).* Spelling may reflect confusion between letter sounds and letter names *(e.g., YIL for WHILE).* Begins to spell a few non-phonetic words conventionally *(e.g., the, who, it).* Piece usually shows a mixture of semi-phonetically, phonetically, and conventionally spelled words. Usually leave spaces between words.	*Such as:* Uses frequently used letter sequences. Vowels are used in every syllable *(not necessarily the correct one/s).* • examples: werd *(word),* tipe *(type),* lasee *(lazy)*	*Such as:* Develops over years of word study and writing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

READING/WRITING DEVELOPMENT CONTINUUM

Reading Development Continuum

Name _____ Date _____

PRE-EMERGENT	EMERGENT	DEVELOPING	BEGINNING READING	EXPANDING
COMPREHENSION ___ **Holds book, correctly turns pages (K.5).** ___ **Shows start/end of book (K.5).** ___ **Distinguishes between a letter, a word, and a numeral (K.5).** **WORD IDENTIFICATION** ___ Knows some letter names. ___ **Has sufficient vocabulary to discuss everyday experiences, events, and objects (K.13).** **ATTITUDE** ___ Pretends to read. ___ **Listens and responds to literature (K.9).** ___ Shows interest in environmental print. ___ Chooses books and his favorites.	**COMPREHENSION** ___ **Demonstrates left-to-right directional movement (K.5).** ___ **Uses props to tell story (original or retelling) with characters and major events (K.6a).** ___ **Identifies topic and supporting details of an informational text read to them (K.6b) (1.3).** **WORD IDENTIFICATION** ___ Rhymes and plays with words. ___ **Recognizes names and high-frequency words (K.8).** ___ Knows some letter sounds in reading or writing contexts. ___ **Identifies most letters of the alphabet (K.7).** **ATTITUDE** ___ **Participates in reading of familiar books (K.9).** ___ Memorizes pattern books and familiar books. ___ **Gives and supports personal responses to stories read to them (K.9).** ___ **Maintains interest in chosen books for a short amount of time (e.g., 10 minutes) (K.9).**	**COMPREHENSION** ___ Makes predictions based on pictures and title. ___ **Relies on print and illustrations to construct meaning (1.7).** **WORD IDENTIFICATION** ___ Reads books with word patterns. ___ Tracks words: has one-to-one correspondence. ___ Begins to build a sight word vocabulary to draw upon, with automaticity, when reading. ___ **Identifies upper and lower case letters (1.5).** ___ Knows most letter sounds in reading and writing contexts. **ATTITUDE** ___ Sees self as a reader. ___ **Independently chooses books s/he likes to read and/or look at (1.1).**	**COMPREHENSION** ___ **Independently reads and comprehends beginning-reader books (1.6).** ___ **Self-corrects miscues that affect meaning (1.7) (2.1).** ___ **Reads with freedom from word identification problems, with smoothness, and with attention to end-of-sentence punctuation (fluency) (1.4) (2.1).** ___ **Reconstructs stories to reflect sequence and story elements of stories read to them (setting, characters, problem, and resolution) (1.2).** **WORD IDENTIFICATION** ___ Relies on print more than on illustrations. ___ **Uses picture clues (1.7).** ___ **Uses sentence structure clues (1.7).** ___ **Uses context clues (1.7).** ___ **Uses phonetic clues (1.7)** ___ **Uses an increasing sight word vocabulary (1.7).** **ATTITUDE** ___ **Maintains interest in chosen books for a reasonable amount of time (at least 15 minutes) (1.1).**	**COMPREHENSION** ___ **Independently reads with fluency and comprehension picture books and short chapter books (2.1).** ___ Reads and finishes a variety of materials with guidance (e.g., folktales, poetry, biography, informational material, historical fiction, mystery). ___ Makes inferences which demonstrate understanding of a text read independently. ___ **Gives and supports personal responses (e.g., point of view, connections to prior experiences) to stories read independently (2.2).** ___ **Reconstructs stories to reflect sequence and story elements of stories read by student (setting, characters, problem, and resolution) (2.1).** ___ **Identifies topic and supporting details of informational text read by student (2.3).** **WORD IDENTIFICATION** ___ **Uses reading strategies independently, as needed, to construct meaning (contextual, structural, phonetic) (2.4).** **ATTITUDE** ___ Silent reads for longer periods (at least 20 minutes).

Date when seeing routinely, over time, at an "achieving" level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Writing Development Continuum

Name_____ **Date**_____

Date when seeing routinely, over time, at an "achieving" level.

PRE-EMERGENT	[illegible]	DEVELOPING	[illegible]	[illegible]
PROCESS ___ Uses materials to represent ideas (e.g., finger paints, sand trays, clay, manipulatives). ___ Learning to hold crayon/pencil for drawing/writing. ___ Begins to represent ideas on paper. ___ Tells story about own "writing" while not attending to "print." ___ Tells about own writing by pointing and labeling what they have "written" (i.e., This is a house.).	**PROCESS** ___ **Sees self as writer: "writes" without hesitation for a variety of purposes (e.g., signs, phone numbers, recipes, notes, lists, labels, journals, stories) (K.10).** ___ **Writes to convey meaning whether using scribble, pictures, letter strings, beginning sounds or temporary spelling) (K.10).** ___ Pretends to read own writing (attends to "print" on paper). ___ **Uses a computer.** ___ **Uses a computer for writing.** **PRODUCT** ___ **Copies names and familiar words (K.11).** ___ **Writes first and last name by memory with recognizable letters (K.12).** **ATTITUDE** ___ Shows comfort using a form of temporary spelling.	**PROCESS** ___ Begins to read own writing. ___ Writing is from left-right, top-bottom. ___ Begins to use spacing between words. ___ May interchange upper and lower case letters. **PRODUCT** ___ Begins to write noun-verb phrases. **ATTITUDE** ___ Takes risks with writing.	**PROCESS** ___ **Chooses topics to write about (1.8).** ___ **Uses some pre-writing strategies (1.8).** ___ **Composes a first draft with two or more connected thoughts on a topic (1.9) (1.11).** ___ **Reads own writing several days later with consistency of meaning (1.9).** ___ **Responds with positive comments to the content of another author's work (1.10).** ___ Begins to revise by adding on. ___ Experiments with capitals and punctuation. ___ Forms letters legibly. ___ Begins to use upper and lower case letters conventionally. ___ **Makes at least one revision while composing a draft at the computer.** **PRODUCT** ___ **Writes pieces using spellings that others can read (1.11).**	**PROCESS** ___ **Uses some pre-writing strategies independently (at least one of which involves writing) (2.5).** ___ Begins to consider audience. ___ **Writes fluently: spelling and mechanics do not interfere with the flow of transferring thoughts to paper (2.6).** ___ **Listens to peers' writing and offers feedback (positive comments and requests for additional information) (2.7).** ___ **Revises by adding description and detail (2.8a/b).** ___ **Proofreads for conventions (e.g., capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) using proofreading strategies (2.9).** ___ Forms letters with ease. ___ **Makes at least one revision and one editing change while composing a draft at the computer.** **PRODUCT** ___ **Composes personal narratives or imaginative stories with beginning, middle and end, using complete thoughts (2.10).**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

REPORT TO PARENTS

[redacted]
Kindergarten Report to Parents
1997-98

NAME: _____ ATTENDANCE: Fall Winter Spring

TEACHER: _____ Half Days Absent ____ ____ ____

SCHOOL: _____ Times Tardy ____ ____ ____

Before reading this report, please read the informational letter attached.

LEARNING AND SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

We believe that these behaviors contribute to student learning and are considered an integral part of our teaching. We do not expect that all children will demonstrate consistency at all times, but we do emphasize continual progress for the student in demonstrating the behavior on a regular basis. Your child's progress is indicated according to the KEY at the right.

KEY	
S	= Satisfactory
P	= Making Progress
I	= Needs to Improve

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Demonstrates responsibility for own learning.			
1. Shows interest and is involved in learning.			
2. Attends to the task at hand.			
3. Completes tasks independently.			
Responds to teacher-directed activities.			
4. Listens attentively.			
5. Participates constructively in discussions.			
6. Participates constructively in activities.			
7. Follows directions.			

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Demonstrates self-discipline.			
8. Follows rules.			
9. Demonstrates self control.			
10. Uses time wisely.			
Interacts positively with peers and adults.			
11. Respects the rights of others.			
12. Works cooperatively with others.			
13. Interacts positively with others.			
14. Solves problems constructively.			

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Puts forth effort.			
15. Perseveres even when tasks are difficult.			
16. Willing to take risks and try new things.			
17. Chooses and accepts tasks that challenge abilities.			

The goal is that all students will attain mastery of these kindergarten learning outcomes. Most students will not demonstrate achievement until the end of the year. There are additional language arts and mathematics outcomes which are taught but not reported on this form, and of which mastery is not expected at this time. Your child's progress is indicated according to the KEY at the right.

KEY	
BE	= Beginning
DEV	= Developing
SE	= Secure
Unmarked item: Does not apply at this time	

MATHEMATICS	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
1. Names and recognizes circles, squares, triangles, and rectangles.									
2a. Counts, by rote, to twenty (20).									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
2b. Uses one-to-one correspondence to count twenty (20) objects.									
2c. Demonstrates cardinality. Knows that when a set of objects is counted, the last counting word said indicates the total number of objects in the set.									
2d. Recognizes numerals from zero through ten (0-10).									
3. Instantly recognizes the quantity in sets of up to five (5) objects.									
4. Provides correct oral responses for all the number combinations for four (4) and five (5). For instance, knows that five is the same as 3+2, 1+4, 5+0, etc.									
5. Models and discusses addition and subtraction stories. Provides correct model and explanation for addition and subtraction story problems s/he is told.									
6. Sorts and classifies sets of objects by their attributes.									
7a. Extends and explains patterns.									
7b. Creates and explains patterns.									
8a. Estimates lengths of objects using non-standard units. Applies strategies such as "benchmarks" to estimate the length of an object.									
8b. Measures lengths of objects using non-standard units.									
9a. Creates real/object graphs. Given a piece of graph paper, independently and correctly creates a graph using a set of objects.									
9b. Interprets data from graphs. Over time, routinely answers a variety of questions about a variety of graphs.									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name_____

NOTE: 1. *These charts document the developmental stages of reading, writing, and spelling from kindergarten through second grade.*
2. *The double-lined box indicates the level at which most kindergarten students will be by the end of the school year.*
3. *The dotted lines are dated to show what the student's reading is like most of the time, at this point in the school year. In reality, most students will display behaviors in more than one category.*

Reading

PRE-EMERGENT	EMERGENT	DEVELOPING	BEGINNING	EXPANDING
• Knows how to hold book, turn pages to proceed through a story from front to back. • Distinguishes between letters, words, and numerals. • Has sufficient vocabulary to discuss everyday experiences, events, and objects. • Listens to, responds to, and discusses stories. • Shows interest in environmental print. • Chooses books and has favorites.	• Tells stories with characters and major events. • Tells about informational books read to them. • Rhymes and plays with words. • Reads some names and words. • Recognizes most letters of the alphabet. • Participates in reading familiar books. • Memorizes pattern books and familiar books. • Remains interested in self-chosen books.	• Relies on print and illustrations to construct meaning of story. • Reads books with word patterns. • Knows an increasing number of words by sight. • Identifies all upper and lower case letters. • Knows most letter sounds. • Independently chooses books s/he likes to look at and read.	• Independently reads and comprehends beginning reader books. • Self-corrects reading errors that affect meaning. • Reads fluently. • Retells a story read to student, including major elements and events in the correct order. • Uses a variety of strategies to construct meaning from a text. • Remains interested in a self-chosen book for a reasonable amount of time.	• Independently reads and comprehends picture books and short chapter books. • Gives and supports personal responses to stories read independently. • Reconstructs and interprets information from a book read independently. • Independently uses a variety of strategies to construct meaning from print. • Chooses appropriately challenging books for extended periods of silent reading.

Reads books such as: Fall	Winter	Spring

Writing

PRE-EMERGENT	EMERGENT	DEVELOPING	BEGINNING	EXPANDING
• Uses materials to represent ideas (e.g., paint, crayons, pencil). • Tells story about own "writing."	• "Writes" for a variety of purposes (e.g., lists, labels, stories). • Knows purpose of writing is to convey a message. • Sometimes copies words needed for work or play activities. • Writes first and last names. • Comfortably uses a form of temporary spelling.	• Reads own writing. • Writes from left to right, top to bottom. • Uses spaces between words. • Writes phrases.	• Chooses own topics to write about. • Writes original stories with several related thoughts. • Responds with relevant comments about the content of another author's work. • Experiments with capitals and punctuation. • Uses spelling that can be read by others.	• Rereads and thinks about own writing and makes some changes or additions. • Uses and proofreads for conventions (e.g., capitalization, punctuation, and standard spelling). • Composes sequenced pieces of writing containing a beginning, middle, and end.

Spelling

PRE-PHONETIC	SEMI-PHONETIC	PHONETIC	TRANSITIONAL	CONVENTIONAL
Pre-phonetic Spelling Stage Writing reflects a pre-communicative form of spelling: • drawing, • scribble writing, • letters strung together randomly.	Semi-phonetic Spelling Stage Begins to apply what they know about letter sounds to their writing. Represents words with beginning and/or ending sounds *(e.g., DG = dog).*	Phonetic Spelling Stage Spells most words like they sound *(e.g., boon = bottom).* Relies, primarily, on auditory memory.	Transitional Spelling Stage Changes from greater reliance on auditory memory of letter sounds to greater reliance on visual memory of spelling patterns. Begins to apply rules, although results may not be correct *(e.g., rite, cete, boan).*	Conventional Spelling Stage Although inconsistencies still exist, student has • accumulated a large body of known words, • shows growing accuracy in applying various language rules, and • shows greater control over spelling resources such as dictionaries.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

SCIENCE

Senses Unit:	1. Five Senses:	Observes ❑	Classifies ❑	Communicates ❑
	2. Explains that ears enable us to hear, eyes to see, nose to smell, tongue to taste			❑
Explorations Through The Seasons Unit:	1. Changes through the seasons:	Observes ❑	Reports ❑	Predicts ❑
	2. Four Seasons:	Describes ❑	Sequences ❑	
Pets Unit:	1. Pet characteristics and needs:	Observes ❑	Classifies ❑	Reports ❑
	2. Inappropriate pets:	Describes ❑		
	✓ *means the student explored scientific concepts through classroom activities.*			

KEY
S = Satisfactory
P = Making Progress
I = Needs to Improve

SOCIAL STUDIES

Children, Here and Around the World, Yesterday and Today

As they investigate and learn about children here and around the world, students will explore shelter, clothing, language, school, play, food and celebrations.

☐ All About Me
☐ Pilgrim Children

Each teacher may choose from among the following cultures/countries. A check mark indicates those which were studied this year.

☐ Children in Australia
☐ Children in Japan
☐ Children in Mexico
☐ Children in _____

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Understands Ideas Studied			
Completes Activities			
Takes Part in Discussion			
Is Developing Thinking and Study Skills			

ART, MUSIC, AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Expresses feelings and ideas through art activities.			
Participates in singing and rhythmic activities.			
Participates in dramatic activities.			
Participates in physical education activities.			

YOUR CHILD WILL BE IN GRADE _____ NEXT YEAR.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Self-evaluation is an important aspect in the development of a child. Your child has been given an opportunity to express feelings, consider relationships with others, and to think about achievements. The responses are recorded exactly as stated by the child.

My friends at school are _____

_____

I feel happy at school when _____

_____

Things I like at school are _____

_____

_____

My favorite story is _____

What I'd like to learn about this year _____

_____

I'm good at _____

_____

COMMENTS FROM THE CONFERENCE:

Child's strengths and abilities:

Goals (Areas for growth):

Knows personal information: Address ❒ Telephone # ❒

First Grade Report to Parents
1997-98

NAME: _____ ATTENDANCE: Fall Winter Spring

TEACHER: _____ Half Days Absent ____ ____ ____

SCHOOL: _____ Times Tardy ____ ____ ____

Before reading this report, please read the informational letter attached.

LEARNING AND SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

We believe that these behaviors contribute to student learning and are considered an integral part of our teaching. We do not expect that all children will demonstrate consistency at all times, but we do emphasize continual progress for the student in demonstrating the behavior on a regular basis. Your child's progress is indicated according to the KEY at the right.

KEY
S = Satisfactory
P = Making Progress
I = Needs to Improve

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Demonstrates responsibility for own learning.			
1. Shows interest and is involved in learning.			
2. Attends to the task at hand.			
3. Completes tasks independently.			
Responds to teacher-directed activities.			
4. Listens attentively.			
5. Participates constructively in discussions.			
6. Participates constructively in activities.			
7. Follows directions.			

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Demonstrates self-discipline.			
8. Follows rules.			
9. Demonstrates self control.			
10. Uses time wisely.			
Interacts positively with peers and adults.			
11. Respects the rights of others.			
12. Works cooperatively with others.			
13. Interacts positively with others.			
14. Solves problems constructively.			

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Puts forth effort.			
15. Perseveres even when tasks are difficult.			
16. Willing to take risks and try new things.			
17. Chooses and accepts tasks that challenge abilities.			

The goal is that all students will attain mastery of these first grade learning outcomes. Most students will not demonstrate achievement until the end of the year. There are additional language arts and mathematics outcomes which are taught but not reported on this form, and of which mastery is not expected at this time. Your child's progress is indicated according to the KEY at the right.

KEY
BE = Beginning
DEV = Developing
SE = Secure
Unmarked Item: Does not apply at this time

MATHEMATICS	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
1. Counts to:									
100 by ones.									
100 by tens.									
100 by fives.									
20 by twos.									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
2. **Counts backwards from twenty (20).**									
3. **Relates counting, grouping, and place value concepts to the numeration system.** Demonstrates an understanding of the relationship of the model, digits, and numerical value.									
4. **Provides instantaneous and correct oral responses for all number combinations for four (4), five (5), and six (6).**									
5. **Creates number stories connected to symbolic models for addition (+) and subtraction (-).** Routinely tells stories with events matching the number sentence for addition and subtraction problems (e.g., 7+2=9 or 6-2=4).									
6. **Uses mathematical language and symbols for equality (=) and inequalities (> and <).** Uses, with understanding, the symbols =(equal), > (greater than) and < (less than).									
7. **Demonstrates, applies, and explains strategies to solve problems.** Asks questions, if necessary, to clarify information. Uses such strategies as drawing a picture, using a physical model, making an organized list or table, identifying and using a pattern.									
8. **Counts coins for totals one dollar ($1.00) or less.**									
9. **Uses and explains a strategy (e.g., benchmarks) to estimate and then measures the length of objects.**									
a. Uses a benchmark and makes an estimate within a reasonable range, using inches and centimeters.	Estimate:								
b. Uses inches and centimeters to correctly measure the length of an object.	Measure:								

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
10. **Tells time to the nearest hour and five-minute interval.**									
11. **Sorts and classifies sets of objects by their attributes, and explains grouping criteria.**									
12. **Extends and explains patterns.**									
13a. **Organizes data on a tally chart.** In response to a question, gathers and organizes information into a tally chart.									
13b. **Interprets data using tally charts.** Routinely answers a variety of descriptive, comparative, and interpretive questions about data displayed in tally charts.									
14. **Describes, models, and classifies the polygons squares, triangles, and rectangles.** Knows the characteristics of each shape.									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name_____

NOTE: 1. *These charts document the developmental stages of reading, writing, and spelling from kindergarten through second grade.*
2. *The double-lined box indicates the level at which most first grade students will be by the end of the school year.*
3. *The dotted lines are dated to show what the student's reading is like most of the time, at this point in the school year. In reality, most students will display behaviors in more than one category.*

Reading

Pre-Emergent	Emergent	Developing	Beginning	Expanding
• Knows how to hold book, turn pages to proceed through a story from front to back. • Distinguishes between letters, words, and numerals. • Has sufficient vocabulary to discuss everyday experiences, events, and objects. • Listens to, responds to, and discusses stories. • Shows interest in environmental print. • Chooses books and has favorites.	• Tells stories with characters and major events. • Tells about informational books read to them. • Rhymes and plays with words. • Reads some names and words. • Recognizes most letters of the alphabet. • Participates in reading familiar books. • Memorizes pattern books and familiar books. • Remains interested in self-chosen books.	• Relies on print and illustrations to construct meaning of story. • Reads books with word patterns. • Knows an increasing number of words by sight. • Identifies all upper and lower case letters. • Knows most letter sounds. • Independently chooses books s/he likes to look at and read.	• Independently reads and comprehends beginning reader books. • Self-corrects reading errors that affect meaning. • Reads fluently. • Retells a story read to student, including major elements and events in the correct order. • Uses a variety of strategies to construct meaning from a text. • Remains interested in a self-chosen book for a reasonable amount of time.	• Independently reads and comprehends picture books and short chapter books. • Gives and supports personal responses to stories read independently. • Reconstructs and interprets information from a book read independently. • Independently uses a variety of strategies to construct meaning from print. • Chooses appropriately challenging books for extended periods of silent reading.

Reads books such as: Fall	Winter	Spring

Writing

Pre-Emergent	Emergent	Developing	Beginning	Expanding
• Uses materials to represent ideas (e.g., paint, crayons, pencil). • Tells story about own "writing."	• "Writes" for a variety of purposes (e.g., lists, labels, stories). • Knows purpose of writing is to convey a message. • Sometimes copies words needed for work or play activities. • Writes first and last names. • Comfortably uses a form of temporary spelling.	• Reads own writing. • Writes from left to right, top to bottom. • Uses spaces between words. • Writes phrases.	• Chooses own topics to write about. • Writes original stories with several related thoughts. • Responds with relevant comments about the content of another author's work. • Experiments with capitals and punctuation. • Uses spelling that can be read by others.	• Rereads and thinks about own writing and makes some changes or additions. • Uses and proofreads for conventions (e.g., capitalization, punctuation, and standard spelling). • Composes sequenced pieces of writing containing a beginning, middle, and end.

Spelling

Pre-Phonetic	Semi-Phonetic	Phonetic	Transitional	Conventional
Pre-phonetic Spelling Stage Writing reflects a pre-communicative form of spelling: • drawing, • scribble writing, • letters strung together randomly.	Semi-phonetic Spelling Stage Begins to apply what they know about letter sounds to their writing. Represents words with beginning and/or ending sounds (*e.g., DG = dog*).	Phonetic Spelling Stage Spells most words like they sound (*e.g., bom = bottom*). Relies, primarily, on auditory memory.	Transitional Spelling Stage Changes from greater reliance on auditory memory of letter sounds to greater reliance on visual memory of spelling patterns. Begins to apply rules, although results may not be correct (*e.g., rite, cote, boan*).	Conventional Spelling Stage Although inconsistencies still exist, student has • accumulated a large body of known words, • shows growing accuracy in applying various language rules, and • shows greater control over spelling resources such as dictionaries.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

SCIENCE

Animals: Insects, fish, birds, mammals	1. Animal life cycles:	Observes ☐	Sequences ☐	Records ☐
	2. Animal body parts:	Describes ☐	Measures ☐	Classifies ☐
	3. Animal needs:	Observes ☐	Predicts ☐	Describes ☐
Sun and Space	1. Sun as source of light and heat:	Observes ☐	Experiments ☐	Records ☐
	2. Shadows:	Makes ☐	Explains ☐	
	3. Reasons for day and night	Observes ☐		
	✓ *means the student explored scientific concepts through classroom activities.*			

KEY
S = Satisfactory
P = Making Progress
I = Needs to Improve

SOCIAL STUDIES

Families, Here and Around the World, Yesterday and Today

As they investigate and learn about families here and around the world, students will explore geography, roles among family members, how people learn from family members, recreation and games that families enjoy together and family traditions and celebrations.

☐ All About Families
☐ Frontier Families

Each teacher may choose from among the following cultures/countries. A check mark indicates those which were studied this year.

☐ Families in China
☐ Families in Guatemala
☐ Families in Kenya
☐ Families in _____

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Understands Ideas Studied			
Completes Activities			
Takes Part in Discussion			
Is Developing Thinking and Study Skills			

YOUR CHILD WILL BE IN GRADE _____ NEXT YEAR.

Second Grade Report to Parents
1997-98

NAME: _____ ATTENDANCE: Fall Winter Spring

TEACHER: _____ Half Days Absent ____ ____ ____

SCHOOL: _____ Times Tardy ____ ____ ____

Before reading this report, please read the informational letter attached.

LEARNING AND SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

We believe that these behaviors contribute to student learning and are considered an integral part of our teaching. We do not expect that all children will demonstrate consistency at all times, but we do emphasize continual progress for the student in demonstrating the behavior on a regular basis. Your child's progress is indicated according to the KEY at the right.

KEY
S = Satisfactory
P = Making Progress
I = Needs to Improve

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Demonstrates responsibility for own learning.			
1. Shows interest and is involved in learning.			
2. Attends to the task at hand.			
3. Completes tasks independently.			
Responds to teacher-directed activities.			
4. Listens attentively.			
5. Participates constructively in discussions.			
6. Participates constructively in activities.			
7. Follows directions.			
Demonstrates self-discipline.			
8. Follows rules.			
9. Demonstrates self control.			
10. Uses time wisely.			
Interacts positively with peers and adults.			
11. Respects the rights of others.			
12. Works cooperatively with others.			
13. Interacts positively with others.			
14. Solves problems constructively.			

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Puts forth effort.			
15. Perseveres even when tasks are difficult.			
16. Willing to take risks and try new things.			
17. Chooses and accepts tasks that challenge abilities.			

The goal is that all students will attain mastery of these second grade learning outcomes. Most students will not demonstrate achievement until the end of the year. There are additional language arts and mathematics outcomes which are taught but not reported on this form, and of which mastery is not expected at this time. Your child's progress is indicated according to the KEY at the right.

KEY
BE = Beginning
DEV = Developing
SE = Secure
Unmarked boxes: Does not apply at this time

MATHEMATICS

	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
1. Demonstrates and explains place value of two-digit numbers using concrete models. Demonstrates an understanding of the relationship of a model, digits, and the numerical value.									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
2. **Provides instantaneous and correct responses for all number combinations through ten.** Example for six: When shown one of the addends (e.g., four), automatically names the other (two).									
3. **Demonstrates, applies, and explains a variety of strategies to solve a variety of problems.** Asks questions, if necessary, to clarify information. Uses such strategies as drawing a picture, using a physical model, making an organized list or table, identifying and using a pattern.									
4. **Uses and explains mental solution strategies.** Uses and explains the process used to mentally compute the answer for such problems as 3+8, 16-8, 47+25.									
5. **Writes and explains number models for stories.** Provides number models for a variety of addition and subtraction story problems.									
6. **Demonstrates and explains addition of two-digit numbers, including regrouping, using drawings or concrete objects.** 1. **Solution strategy** 2. **Model** 3. **Explanation** Performs a written procedure, builds a model of the problem, and explains the relationship between the two.									
7. **Demonstrates and explains subtraction of two-digit numbers, including regrouping, using drawings or concrete objects.** 1. **Solution strategy** 2. **Model** 3. **Explanation** Performs a written procedure, builds a model of the problem, and explains the relationship between the two.									
8. **Uses a variety of coin combinations to create a given amount.** Works comfortably with pennies, nickels, dimes, and quarters.									
9. **Uses estimations involving measurement: linear measurement.** Makes estimates within a reasonable range and explains the use of strategies (e.g., benchmarks) when determining estimates.									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

		Fall			Winter			Spring		
		BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE	BE	DEV	SE
10.	**Uses and explains a standard unit of measurement for length to nearest unit.**									
11.	**Determines and states the rule for a pattern.**									
12a.	**Constructs bar graphs.** Generates a question which leads to collecting and organizing information.									
12b.	**Reads and interprets data.** Routinely describes, compares, and interprets information displayed on tally charts or graphs.									

Name_____

NOTE: 1. *These charts document the developmental stages of reading, writing, and spelling from kindergarten through second grade.*
2. *The double-lined box indicates the level at which most second grade students will be by the end of the school year.*
3. *The dotted lines are dated to show what the student's reading is like most of the time, at this point in the school year. In reality, most students will display behaviors in more than one category.*

Reading

EMERGENT	DEVELOPING	BEGINNING	EXPANDING	BRIDGING
• Tells stories with characters and major events. • Tells about informational books read to them. • Rhymes and plays with words. • Reads some names and words. • Recognizes most letters of the alphabet. • Participates in reading familiar books. • Memorizes pattern books and familiar books. • Remains interested in self-chosen books.	• Relies on print and illustrations to construct meaning of story. • Reads books with word patterns. • Knows an increasing number of words by sight. • Identifies all upper and lower case letters. • Knows most letter sounds. • Independently chooses books s/he likes to look at and read.	• Independently reads and comprehends beginning reader books. • Self-corrects reading errors that affect meaning. • Reads fluently. • Retells a story read to student, including major elements and events in the correct order. • Uses a variety of strategies to construct meaning from a text. • Remains interested in a self-chosen book for a reasonable amount of time.	• Independently reads and comprehends picture books and short chapter books. • Gives and supports personal responses to stories read independently. • Reconstructs and interprets information from a book read independently. • Independently uses a variety of strategies to construct meaning from print. • Chooses appropriately challenging books for extended periods of silent reading.	• Independently reads and comprehends grade-appropriate literature and informational material. • Analyzes key literary elements of a story. • Adjusts reading for different purposes. • Uses strategies for dealing with obstacles to understanding. • Identifies the unique characteristics of a variety of genre. • Participates in discussions of literature and informational articles. • Is committed to investing time and energy in reading.

Reads books such as: Fall	Winter	Spring

Writing

EMERGENT	DEVELOPING	BEGINNING	EXPANDING	BRIDGING
• "Writes" for a variety of purposes (e.g., lists, labels, stories). • Knows purpose of writing is to convey a message. • Sometimes copies words needed for work or play activities. • Writes first and last names. • Comfortably uses a form of temporary spelling.	• Reads own writing. • Writes from left to right, top to bottom. • Uses spaces between words. • Writes phrases. • Comfortably uses a form of temporary spelling.	• Chooses own topics to write about. • Writes original stories with several related thoughts. • Responds with relevant comments about the content of another author's work. • Experiments with capitals and punctuation. • Uses spelling that can be read by others.	• Rereads and thinks about own writing and makes some changes or additions. • Uses and proofreads for conventions (e.g., capitalization, punctuation, and standard spelling). • Composes sequenced pieces of writing containing a beginning, middle, and end.	• Considers audience, purpose and task when writing. • Monitors piece for meaning and logical organization. • Uses conventions. • Uses all five stages of the writing process. • Shares writing with others, discusses insights, accepts advice and gives suggestions to others. • Uses a variety of writing forms. • Sees self as a writer.

Spelling

PRE-PHONETIC	SEMI-PHONETIC	PHONETIC	TRANSITIONAL	CONVENTIONAL
Pre-phonetic Spelling Stage Writing reflects a pre-communicative form of spelling: • drawing, • scribble writing, • letters strung together randomly.	Semi-phonetic Spelling Stage Begins to apply what they know about letter sounds to their writing. Represents words with beginning and/or ending sounds (*e.g., DG = dog*).	Phonetic Spelling Stage Spells most words like they sound (*e.g., bottm = bottom*). Relies, primarily, on auditory memory.	Transitional Spelling Stage Changes from greater reliance on auditory memory of letter sounds to greater reliance on visual memory of spelling patterns. Begins to apply rules, although results may not be correct (*e.g., rits, cote, boan*).	Conventional Spelling Stage Although inconsistencies still exist, student has • accumulated a large body of known words, • shows growing accuracy in applying various language rules, and • shows greater control over spelling resources such as dictionaries.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name _____

SCIENCE

Plants	1. Plants:	Observes ❑	Grows ❑	Measures ❑	Records ❑
	2. Plant parts and use:	Observes ❑	Classifies ❑		
	3. Plant needs:	Observes ❑	Investigates ❑	Records ❑	
	4. Recognizes plant communities and life cycles:			Records ❑	
Sound	1. Investigates vibrations of a variety of objects ❑				
	2. Experiments with pitch and volume ❑				
	3. Explains relationship between volume and noise pollution ❑				
Dinosaurs	1. Classifies dinosaurs by characteristics ❑				
	2. Investigates fossils ❑				
	3. Matches fossil clues to dinosaur characteristics ❑				
	✓ *means the student explored scientific concepts through classroom activities.*				

KEY
S = Satisfactory
P = Making Progress
I = Needs to Improve

SOCIAL STUDIES

	Topics Studied
	Doing and Deciding
	Things, Places, People
	Needs and Wants
	Belonging to Groups
	Alike and Different
	Being Yourself in Groups
	Making Changes
	Map and Globe Skills
	_____
	Alternative Program for Combination-Grade Class

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Understands Ideas Studied			
Completes Activities			
Takes Part in Discussion			
Is Developing Thinking and Study Skills			

YOUR CHILD WILL BE IN GRADE _____ NEXT YEAR.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F

READING DEVELOPMENT CONTINUUM END-OF-GRADE LEVEL BOOK LISTS

Reading Development Continuum End-of-Grade Level Book Lists

Note: *1. (•) Indicates additional titles provided by teachers in workshops or used by teachers for end-of-year assessment.*
2. "Typical" pre-reading introduction may be given to the book before students reads it for the first time.
3. Story should have been read recently by student, but not used for instruction.

	DEVELOPING		
After having multiple experiences with a book, "reads" little predictable books that: • have been memorized, • have repetitive/cumulative patterns, • have rhyming patterns and/or • have familiar sequences (e.g., alphabet, colors, numbers). "Reads" books attending only to pictures. After having an introduction, reads little predictable books such as Levels A or B of Story Box, Sunshine, e.g., • *The Ghost* • *In the Mirror* • *Huggles Breakfast* • *Monster Sandwich* • *The Tree House* • *Yuck Soup* • *The Pumpkin*• • *In a Dark, Dark Woods*•	Reads books such as: • *Nobody Listens to Andrew* • *Where Are You Going, Little Mouse?* • *Whose Mouse Are You?* • *Where's Spot?* • *A Kiss for Little Bear* • Margaret Hillert books • *My New Boy* • Phonetic readers • Simple word pattern books	Reads beginning reader books such as: • *Frog and Toad Are Friends*• • *Frog and Toad All Year* • *Owl at Home* • *Little Bear* • *Little Bear's Visit* • *Mouse Soup* • *Mouse Tales* • *Danny and the Dinosaur* • *Henry and Mudge: The First Book*• • *And I Mean It, Stanley*• • *Jeremy's Tail* (HBJ)• • *The Case of the Cat's Meow*• • *I Am Not Afraid*• • *Lovable Lyle*• • *Arthur's Tooth*• • Amelia Bedelia books • Francis books	Reads picture books and short chapter books such as: • *Freckle Juice*• • *The Littles* • *The Tenth Good Thing About Barney* • *Ming Lo Moves the Mountain*• • *Wagon Wheels*• • Julian stories • Cam Jansen books • Boxcar Children books • Horrible Harry series • Magic Tree House series • *Monster in the Third Dresser Drawer* • *Dr. DeSoto* • *The Terrible Eek* (HBJ)• • *Ma Lien and the Magic Brush*• • *Alexander, Who Used to Be Rich....*• • *The Day Jimmy's Boa Ate the Wash*• • *Sidewalk Story*• • Polk Street series • Bailey School Kids books • Junie B. Jones books • Marvin Redpost books
			• *Nate the Great*

These lists reflect a refinement of lists used last year, based on (1) development of the Primary Continuum and (2) increased teacher experience and recommendations. Refinement will continue as continued experience and dialogue inform our professional judgments and decisions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX G

HOLLIE'S PROFILE (MS. CARTER'S MARKING)

1. Report Card:
    Reading:
        Beginning (1st grade level)
        11/97 3/98
        "Frog & Toad Together"

    Writing:
        Developing
        10/97
        Beginning (1st grade level)
        3/98

    Spelling
        Phonetic (1st grade level)
        10/97
        Transitional
        3/98

2. Reading Development Continuum:

        DEVELOPING

COMPREHENSION

2/97- Makes predictions based on pictures and title.
5/97- Relies on print and illustrations to construct meaning (1.7)

WORD IDENTIFICATION

2/97- Reads books with word patterns.
2/97- Tracks words: has one-to-one correspondence.
2/97- Begins to build a sight word vocabulary to draw upon, with authomaticity, when reading.
2/97- Identifies upper and lower case letters (1.5)
2/97- knows most letter sounds in reading and writing contexts.

ATTITUDE

2/97- Sees self as a reader
2/97- Independently chooses books s/he likes to read and/or look at (1.1)

BEGINNING

COMPREHENSION

5/97- Independently read and comprehends beginning-reader books (1.6).
11/97- Self-corrects miscues that affect meaning (1.7) (2.1)
11/97- Reads with freedom from word identification problems, with smoothness, and with attention to end-of-sentence punctuation (fluency) (1.4) (2.1).
( )- Reconstructs stories to reflect sequence and story elements of stories read to them (setting, characters, problem, and resolution) (1.2)

WORK IDENTIFICATION

11/97- Relies on print more than on illustrations.
5/97- Uses pictures clues (1.7).
( )- Uses sentence structure clues (1.7).
11/97- Uses context clues (1.7).
11/97- Uses phonetic clues (1.7)
11/97- Uses an increasing sight word vocabulary (1.7)

ATTITUDE

11/97- Maintains interest in chosen books for a reasonable amount of time (at least 15 minutes) (1.1).

3. Writing Development Continuum:

DEVELOPING

PROCESS

11/97- Begins to read own writing
11/97- Writing is from left-right, top-bottom.
11/97- Begins to use spacing between words.
11/97- May interchange upper and lower case letters.

PRODUCT

11/97- Begins to write moun-verb phrase.

ATTITUDE

11/97- Takes risks with writing.

BEGINNING

PROCESS

11/97- Chooses topics to write about (1.8).
3/98- Uses some pre-writing strategies (1.8).
3/98- Composes a first draft with two or more connected thoughts on a topic (1.9) (1.11).
3/98- Reads own writing several days later with consistency of meaning (1.9).
3/98- Responds with positive comments to the content of another author's work (1.10).
3/98- Begins to revise by adding on.
11/97- Experiments with capitals and punctuation.
( )- Forms letters legibly.
11/97- Begins to use upper and lower case letters conventionally.
( )- Makes at least on revision while composing a draft at the computer.

PRODUCT

3/98- Writes pieces using spellings that others can read (1.11).

EXPANDING

PROCESS

( )- Uses some pre-writing strategies independently (at least one of which involves writing) (2.5)
( )- Begins to consider audience.
3/98- Writes fluently:
spelling and mechanics do not interfere with the flow of transferring thoughts to paper (2.6)
( )- Listens to peers' writing and offers feedback (positive comments and requests for additional information) (2.7).
( )- Revises by adding description and detail (2.8a/b)
3/98- Proofreads for conventions (e.g., capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) using proofreading strategies (2.9).
( )- Forms letters with ease.
( )- Makes at least one revision and one editing change while composing a draft at the computer.

PRODUCT

( )- Composes personal narratives or imaginative stories with beginning, middle and end, using complete thoughts (2.10).

APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER FOR DRAFT REVIEW

Date: November 1, 1999
To: Ms. (last name)
From: Ashley Lanting
(my telephone number)
(my e-mail address)
(my address)

Re: Draft Review

Dear Ms. (last name),

Thank you for helping me with my research at (name) School. Would you please comment on the draft of my study where you and/or your words are featured? Please review the material for accuracy. You are encouraged to provide alternative language or interpretation. Thank you very much.

Your pseudonym in this draft is Ms. Ford. A list of your students' actual names and pseudonyms is as follows:

(actual names)	(Pseudonyms)
	Kristin
	Ellen
	Hillary
	Joy
	Jesse
	Kim
	Lisa
	Tracy
	Oliver
	Troy

If it is possible I would like to meet with you regarding your feedback by the end of November. Thanks again.

VITA

ASHLEY LANTING

Formative Evaluation Research Associates (FERA)
1810 Cooley Ave.
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

EDUCATION

A.M in Educational Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL, May 1994.

B.B.A. in Business/International Trade, Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan, June 1984.

Well-versed in quantitative and qualitative data analysis software, such as SPSS, SAS, JMP, MINITAB, TI-86, and QRS NUD*IST.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Research Assistant, Formative Evaluation Research Associates, 1999 to present. Evaluating the "Wrap-Around" Process, a community health program for at-risk youth in Lenawee County, Michigan.

Substitute Teacher, Lenawee Intermediate School District, 1998 to present. Teaching K-12 all subjects in Adrian Public Schools.

Adjunct Faculty, Department of Mathematics and Engineering Sciences, Jackson Community College, 1996 to present. Course titles: Introduction Probability and Statistics, Plane Trigonometry, Intermediate Algebra, Business Math, and Beginning Algebra.

Research Assistant, Research Opportunities Office, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1995 – 1996. Identified funding resources for College of Education faculty. Co-authored Internet web pages for the Bureau of Educational Research. Assisted preparation of grant applications and proposals.

Research Assistant to Professor Georgia Garcìa, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Illinois, 1994-1995. Collected observational and visual data in a multilingual preschool program. Interfaced with Professor Garcìa to discuss, review and analyze data.

SCHOLORLY PRESENTATION

Lanting, Ashley (1996). Home language maintenance and second language acquisition. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Second Language Research Form, Tucson, AZ.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

Lanting, Ashley (1998). Information teachers gained from a district-wide K-2 performance assessment program and their use of the information. Invited presentation, Northeastern Educational Research Association, NY.

Lanting, Ashley (2000). An Empirical Study of a District Wide K-2 Performance Assessment: Teacher Practices, Information Gained, and Use of Assessment Results. Invited presentation, Consortium of Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, San Jose, CA.

AWARDS

Thesis/Project Support Grant, Fall 1994.

Out-standing ESL Curriculum Design - Curriculum was transferred to University electronic database for the use of ESL teachers.

Academic Award, 1981.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION

Michigan Educational Research Association